Foucault on Freedom

An Analytical Examination of foucauldian Philosophy

By

Dr.Ali Muhamamd Rizvi

Karachi University Research Forum

جامعہ کراچی دارُلتحقیق برائے علم و دانش

Kurf™.
Karachi University Research Forum:2107.
Title: Foucault on Freedom.
Author: Dr.Ali Muhamamd Rizvi.
Key words:Dr.Ali Muhammad Rizvi, Kurf, Philosophy ,western Philosophy, Muslim philosophy,Ghazali,PostModernism,Modernism,Liberalism,Secularism,Democracy,Capitalism,Socialism,East,West,Focualt,Rawls,Habermass,Political Science, Economics, Social Sciences, Meta –Physics.
Front Page, Table of Content ,Setting and E-Presentation By:
Dr.Muhammad Ali Junaid.
Courtesy: Syed Khalid Jamiee.

All Rights Reserved no part of This Edition may be copied and published In Any form without the prior permission of Editor, Author and KURF. however, E-Edition is free to Download and citation or may be snap shot to refer any citation.

www.facebook.com/kurf.ku
www.facebook.com/groups/kurfku
www.kurfku.blogspot.com

Karachi University Research Forum

جامعہ کراچی دارالتحقیق برائے علم و دانش

S.No	Titles/Headings	Page.NO
1.	Acknowledgement	3
2.	Abstract: Hypothesis: Methodology:	5
3.	Introduction	8
4.	Chapter 1 : Foucault on Freedom	12
5.	Freedom: the Universal	13
6.	This new deity is defined in terms of freedom.	13
7.	Foucault and Freedom	19
8.	Two Senses of Negative Freedom in Foucault	23
9.	Foucault's Conception of Negative Freedom	34
10.	Negative Freedom and Knowledge	49
11.	Foucault’s Conception of Positive freedom	51
12.	Positive Freedom as Construction of self	53
13.	Positive Freedom as Aesthetics of Existence	55
14.	Positive Freedom as Practice	59
15.	Conclusion:	61-62
16.	Chapter:2 : Foucault’s Analysis Of Modern Capitalism	63
17.	The Conditions of the Possibility of Capitalism	73
18.	Capitalist Subjectivisation Regime	73
19.	Capitalist Truth Regime	78
20.	Capitalist State	93
21.	Management of Freedom through Freedom	101
22.	Market State and Freedom	106
23.	Foucault’s Critique of the Marxist Critique of Capitalism	115
24.	Conclusion	127
25.	Chapter: 3: Foucauldian Struggles	128
26.	Fundamental Structure of Struggles	135
27.	Negative Struggles	135
28.	Questioning (Problematisation)	136
29.	Limit Attitude and Transgression	139
30.	Positive Struggles	141
31.	Foucauldian Struggles	147
32.	Struggles and their Nature	148
33.	Struggle against Capitalist Governance	149
34.	Struggle against Capitalist Epistemology	152
35.	Struggle against Capitalist Subjectivity	159
36.	The Possibility of SystemWide Resistance	164
37.	Conclusion	171
38.	Notes on Chapter I	173
39.	Notes on Chapter II	175
40.	Notes on Chapter III	177
41.	Appendix	178-181
42.	Bibliography	182
43.	REFERENCES	182-185

Acknowledgement

One who does not thank people does not thank Allah - Muhammad (PBUH).

I have received support for this project, directly and indirectly, from more people and institutions than I can mention here. Mostly I must acknowledge colleagues and friends at the Department of Philosophy University of Karachi. Among them special mention is due of Dr. S.M.A Saeed, Dr. Kazi A. Kadir, Dr. Arifa Farid, Zahoor ul Hasan Babar, Dr. Javed Iqbal Ameeri, Dr. Basharat Tayyib, Abdul Wahab Suri, Zulfiqar, Rahim, Mustafa. To all participants of our Sunday seminar at Islamic Research Academy specially Idrees Ismail, Javed Iqbal, Yonus Qadiri, Muhammad Tahir, Naufil, Amjad, Syyid Khalid among others. Teachers and friends at Departments of Philosophy, Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick and all participants of Warwick's Sociology Department's fortnightly evening seminar are duly remembered and acknowledged. Special mention is in order of Professor Roger Trigg, Dr. Nick Land, Dr. Peter Poellner, Dr. Ian Layn, Dr. Kieth Ansel Pearson, G. Wang, Clarence Maxwel, A. Kalgerpoalos, Lene, Richard, Lee, Qadri bhai, Kapila, Shahzaib and all others. Special thanks are to Dr. Stuart Elden who sent me his unpublished piece, which was of great help.

Concerning College of Business Management I would like to thank all those who have made working here enjoyable. I would single out in this context my colleagues Jamal Zubairi, Furrukh Amin, Wajahat, Najeeb, Asif, Farooq, Waqar sahib, Molvi sahib and all others. Special thanks are due to the Management of the College for providing excellent working environment and printing, copying and other essential facilitates.

This list would remain incomplete without mentioning my friends A. Qadir, Riaz Farooqi and others for our stimulating informal evening discussions in the beautiful garden of Liaquat National Library.

In the end I would like to thank my family members, my parents, brothers, sisters, my wife and little daughter for providing love, support and above all for bearing with me.

Thanks are also due to Mr. Asim A. Yousfi for typing and retyping the manuscript. Earlier Mr. Arshad Faridi had provided similar help. Mr. Abdul Qadeer Bukhari also provided considerable assistance.

Finally and most importantly, my greatest intellectual spiritual thanks and acknowledgements go to my supervisor and mentor professor Dr. Javed Ansari. In an age when people are lost in the way he has directed us to Holzweg der Holzweg (path of paths) that leads to our original home.

Ai shah-e-Ushshaq sheereen Dastan
Baz go az bai neshane men neshan sarf o nahvo manteqam ra sokhti Atesh e ishq e Khuda afrokhti.

I dedicate this thesis to my little daughter Zahra Batul Rizvi whose age is the same as the time consumed in writing this thesis.

Abstract

Hypothesis:

"As struggles for freedom Foucauldian struggles are seen by and conceptualised by Foucault as struggles that (may) pose system wide danger to capitalism.

Methodology:

The study is exclusively based on Foucault's own work and consists of reflection and interpretation of the same. Wherever secondary sources are cited they are meant to provide **additional** evidence only.

The study consists of three chapters. The theme and purpose of each chapter is summarised below.

Chapter I

The purpose of the first chapter is to provide the context of the whole study. It depicts freedom as the universal that provides the ideal and reference point of Foucauldian struggles. But Foucault's conception of freedom and his allegiance to freedom and its basis are not

stated explicitly anywhere in his work. Due to this we were obliged to reconstruct Foucault's conception of freedom in detail. This reconstruction was essential for two reasons.

a) To determine the overall structure of Foucauldian struggle.

b) To situate Foucauldian struggles in the context of European modernity.

Chapter II

This chapter consists of a detailed analysis of Foucault's conception and analysis of capitalism and the mode of capitalist governance. In this context we have at the end of the chapter tried to differentiate between Foucault's conception and analysis of capitalism and Marxist conception and analysis of capitalism. This chapter has been essential in the context of our thesis particularly for three reasons:

a) It demonstrates clearly that though capitalism thrives on diversity, it directs this diversity towards a single dominant singularity which Foucault calls subjection. Foucault denies the necessity of the subjection while recognising its positivity. Foucauldian struggles are struggles against capitalist subjection.

b) It also clearly establishes the fact that Foucauldian struggles are not struggles against exploitation. Exploitation is not seen as the prime modus operandi of capitalist order.

c) It establishes that Foucauldian struggles seek to transcend relational regime characteristic of modern capitalism by promoting diversity and reducing domination/subjection.

Chapter III

This chapter describes the overall nature of Foucauldian struggles and defines their general and specific structure. At the end it raises the question of system wide resistance to capitalism. The question is raised on the basis that:

a) Capitalist relational regime's basic function is to increase diversity in such a manner that this diversity converges to the singularity of capital accumulation.

b) Foucauldian struggles are defined as struggles against individual specific mechanisms that makes such convergence possible and struggles are focused on an alternative, which does not imply such a function.

c) In this sense Foucault sees struggles having the potential of posing system wide danger to capitalism by attacking the mechanisms and regimes which guide expressions of diversity to the singularity of accumulation. Needless to say Foucault does not claim any inevitability that the struggles would pose any such threat, but he does believe that specific struggles can converge without positing an anti capital singularity. This thesis does not examine the validity of this assumption.

Introduction

This is a study in Foucault's thought. We try to investigate whether Foucault conceptualises the spontaneous, non centralised, local struggles he saw emerging during his life time, as (potentially) having capability of posing threat to capitalism.

We study Foucauldian struggles as conceptualised by Foucault himself (at least according to one possible and fairly legitimate reading of Foucault) and we do not aim to develop critique of Foucault at this stage but at discovering Foucauldian **reasons** for waging these struggles and at finding out Foucauldian **aims** regarding these struggles. Needless to say that no interpretation and reconstruction can be accomplished without certain presuppositions, certain immanent critique already operating, within the act of interpreting. But this is not limited to our study as it is true for any interpretation and does not annul the difference between interpretation and critique.

Two essential ingredients of any understanding of Foucauldian struggles (to my mind) i.e. his notion of freedom and his understanding of capitalism remain largely implicit in his genealogical studies. For this reason it was incumbent upon us in order to arrive at any coherent and viable understanding of Foucauldian struggle that we reconstruct Foucault's conception of freedom and capitalism in detail. In this context it seemed more feasible and reasonable to restrict ourselves to an interpretation and postpone its critique to some other occasion.

It is in this context that you are requested to read the remaining three chapters of this study.

The first chapter is about Foucault's conception of freedom. The purpose of this chapter is to conceptualise Foucauldian struggles as struggles for freedom. This shows that Foucauldian struggles are situated in the overall matrix of Western civilisation and do not aim to transcend this matrix. The second aim of this reconstruction is to show that Foucauldian variations on the theme of freedom are dictated by his commitment to freedom. The chapter situates Foucault beyond the facile dichotomy of individualism Vs collectivism by presenting him as a thinker who pursues commitment to individualism in the context of the conception of self that is constituted by and sustained by the web of relations.

The second chapter reconstructs Foucault's conception of capitalism. The interpretation presented here is different from most of the contemporary analyses of Foucault in that they either interpret Foucault as a theorist of power who has nothing to say about economy or on the other hand as a theorist who upholds the flag of what Foucault calls the notion of 'economic functionality of power' (PK p. 88), who sees power as the instrument of forces of production and class domination. Our Interpretation presupposes the rejection of both these approaches as vulgar and reductionist approaches without explicitly developing their rejection. Our approach remains true to Foucault's relational ontology, his essential structuralism and rescues his analysis form coarse reductionism. We argue that Foucault sees power, truth, and subjectivisation regimes as the condition of the possibility, performance and continued sustenance of capitalism. These regimes are not just instruments of the accumulation. The possibility of their playing any instrumental role presupposes a primordial relation between these regimes and principles on which accumulation process is based. This amounts to saying that Foucault as a structuralist relates these regimes to the accumulation

process not through any causal relationship but through structural isomorphism (this is what primiordiality means in the Foucauldian context). It is in the light of this basic understanding that we reconstruct Foucault's understanding of modern capitalism. The chapter ends by briefly considering Foucault's critique of Marxism in order to further clarify his understanding of capitalism and in order to provide basis for distinguishing Foucauldian conception of struggles from Marxist conception of struggles.

The third chapter analyses Foucault's conception of struggles. As struggles for freedom they reflect the structure of freedom. On the general level struggles are divided into negative and positive struggles corresponding to Negative and Positive freedom. One the specific level struggles are responses to the specific regime prevalent in the present (capitalism). Negatively Foucauldian struggles try to transcend the specific elements in present relational regime that limit freedom while on the positive side they try to reconstitute relations in such a manner that they do not limit the ambit of freedom and diversity. The crucial problematic of Foucauldian struggles and their aspiration in this context is to transcend the singularity of capital accumulation without reimposing a new singularity. Of course Foucauldian struggle also have their singularity but that singularity is pure negativity in the sense that it is a singularity that there should be no singularity and only positive manifestation of this singularity allowed, are the entailments of this negative singularity (this is what we have termed as thin conception of positive struggles in the study). This is how Foucault conceptualises his struggles. Here our study ends without problematising the crucial Foucauldian assertion that a singularity can be challenged without positing any (positive) singularity and without positing any thick conception of reconstitution of relations.

Foucault on Freedom

I

Foucault on Freedom

[Freedom] is actually the reason that men live together at all. Without it, political life would be meaningless. The raison detre of politics is freedom, and its field of experience is action.

Arendt Between Past and Present[1]

I do not know whether it must be said today that the critical task still entails faith in Enlightenment; I continue to think (however) that this task requires work on our limits, that is, a patient labour giving form to our impatience for liberty.

Foucault What is Enlightenment[2]

[The project of Enlightenment] is not seeking to make possible a metaphysics that has finally become a science. It is seeking to give a new impetus, as far and wide possible; to the undefined work of Freedom.

Foucault What is Enlightenment[3]

1.1 Freedom: the Universal

The theme of freedom is central to Foucault's work. This is so in two different senses. In the first place, it is an explicit and implicit ideal, which animates his whole work. Secondly, it provides the basis for his critique of modern discursive and non-discursive practices. However despite the centrality of freedom for Foucault's work, it is also clear, that nowhere in Foucault's work is the question of freedom and its problems systematically and consistently addressed and dealt with. Hence, one has to agree with the succinct observation of Bell that although "there is a persistence of the question of freedom in Foucault" and he turns to it "frequently" but nowhere does he deal with it with a "sustained attention" (1996 p. 83). Foucault is a postmodern philosopher precisely in the sense that his point of departure is a presupposition that a consensus exists on the idea of freedom, at least a minimalist consensus that freedom is desirable. From this view point Foucault's context is different from modernist philosophers, for example Kant and Hegel, because their point of departure is Christianity and not modernism in the sense that they are seeking to establish a consensus on the idea of freedom[4]. Foucault does not have to establish this consensus; he is within an already established consensus[5]. To understand Foucault's conception of freedom one should always keep this difference in mind. To understand Foucault is to be reminded of those momentous civilisational changes that have now become norms, which at most had only begun to get ascendancy during the days of Kant and Hegel. Tawny has summarised the nature of the great transformation in these telling words:

> "Dr. Figgis has described the secularisation of political theory as the most momentous of the intellectual changes which ushered in the modern world. It was not the less revolutionary because it

> was only gradually that its full consequences became apparent, so that seeds which were sown before the Reformation yielded their fruit in England only after the Civil War. The political aspects of the transformation are familiar. The theological mould which shaped political theory from the Middle Ages to the seventeenth century is broken; politics becomes a science, ultimately a group of sciences, and theology at best one science among others. Reason takes the place of revelation, and the criterion of political theory is expediency,[6] not religious authority. Religion, ceasing to be the master interest of mankind, dwindles into a department of life with boundaries which it is extravagant to overstep" (1959 p. 23).

Hence the historical meaning of the question of freedom lies in grasping the significance and meaning of the great transformation that occurred in Europe in the wake of which the epistemological, metaphysical hegemony of Christianity was overthrown. The normative authority of God was rejected, at least in practice, and they were transferred to a new deity/idol. This new divinity is human beings as individuals or human beings as collectivity. **This new deity is defined in terms of freedom.**

Freedom is the central concept of Enlightenment. Historically speaking freedom is the rejection of the religious ideals of the ultimate authority of revelation and love (surrender). This is exactly how Kant defines Enlightenment: "Enlightenment is man's exodus from his self incurred immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one's understanding without the guidance of another person. This immaturity is self-incurred if its cause lies not in the weakness of the understanding, but in indecision and lack of courage to use mind without guidance of another. "Dare to know' (**aude sapere**)! Have the courage to use your own understanding; this is the motto of Enlightenment" (Kant 1949 p. 132 translation amended).

Enlightenment conception of freedom can be understood in negative as well as positive terms. According to the meaning given to these terms first by Machiavelli and then given canonical expression by Kant, Negative freedom means freedom 'from' while Positive freedom means 'freedom to'.

Negative freedom embodies the rejection of the normative power of any external (alien) authority (causes) over human affairs. As Kant writes, "The will is a kind of causality belonging to living beings insofar as they are rational; freedom would be the property of this causality that makes it effective **independent of any determination by alien causes"** (Kant 1981 p. 49 emphasis added).

Negative freedom may be interpreted in two ways. It can be either interpreted as the prerogative of every human being as an individual. Alternatively, it can be interpreted as the right of not every individual but of human beings as collectivity. The first is often termed as individualism, while the second as communitarianism. Kant may be taken as the paradigm thinker of the first while Hegel may be taken as the leader of the second school. Freedom in the positive sense **presupposes** and **follows** from the negative sense of freedom. In its most primitive and historical sense, **Positive freedom** means the right of every human being as individual as well as human beings as collectivity to determine their own way of life without intervention from without. As Kant writes: "What else, then, can freedom of the will be but autonomy, i.e. **the property that will has of being a law unto itself**?" (ibid. emphasis added).

Negative freedom implies freedom from Christianity and its authority and Positive freedom implies in the wake of that freedom the articulation of one's life according to one's own will. Kant's heirs interpreted articulation of one's own life in two different ways. These different interpretations hinge upon what one construes by 'one's own' (conception of self). Those who interpret 'ones own' as an atomistic conception of the self, form the stream of Enlightenment we know as liberalism. Others interpreted 'ones own' as a communal conception of self, which posits self not as pitched against its larger context and environment but formed by it. The prime proponent of this interpretation was Hegel who famously said that for 'freedom' to be realised it was necessary that there should be no 'other: "(F)reedom means that the object with which you deal is a second self . . . For freedom it is necessary that we should feel no presence of something which is not ourselves" (Hegel 1951 p. 49). The school that follows Hegel's lead has been termed as communitarian (Sandel ed. 1984).

The liberals left it to the individual to positively determine his life on the ground that:

a) It is sufficient for the realisation of Positive freedom that one be free in a negative sense.

b) The individual self-determination does not depend upon any specific conception of how the web of relations should be constituted since the act of self-determination takes place essentially outside this web.

c) To link self-determination to any specific conception of (ideal) society leads to heteronomy because it is the subsumption of one's self to external causes i.e. to the web of relations in which one finds oneself.

The communitarians on the other hand consider Negative freedom without the reconstitution of the web of relations in which one finds oneself to be a chimera, a pure negativity, for two reasons:

a) First because a conception of the self not affected by and constituted by relationships is a factual absurdity. It is contrary to a human Being in the World.

b) It is normatively undesirable. The self should be constituted by its web of relationships. Thus for self determination to be realised, a reconstitution of the web of relations according to the requirements of self-determination is a necessity according to the communitarians. Not all situating of self in the context of its web of relations is heteronomous. The conception of an ideal web of relations is the condition of the realisation of Positive freedom. This conception has led to a plethora of utopias witnessed in the nineteenth and twentieth century, which were deemed necessary for the realisation of freedom. One can realise one's freedom only in an ideal society. One can understand such diverse movement as communism and German National Socialism in their context (see Sandel ed. 1984, Berlin 1969).

There are two basic differences between liberals and communitarians that emerge from the above discussion:

a) Communitarians consider a specific reconstitution of the web of relations as necessary while liberals consider it to be contrary to Negative freedom.

b) Communitarians differentiate between factual and normative conception of Negative freedom while the liberals do not make such a distinction.

As we can see now, consensus exists on a minimalist agenda of Negative freedom and the practical implication of this in the context of the West is the rejection of Christianity in its orthodox forms (rejection of Christian epistemology and the decline in the social hegemony of the church and its related values etc). This minimalist programme forms the basis of the civilisation, which replaced medieval Christian civilisation in Europe. This is what connects such diverse thinkers as Kant, Hegel and Marx and such opposing movements as communism and liberalism: "Both doctrines (liberalism and Soviet Marxism) emanate from within the very heart of 'western civilisation'. Both classical Marxism and Soviet communism were late flowerings of ancient western traditions. Rightly, their founders and followers saw themselves as heirs to a tradition that included the classical theories of Adam Smith and David Ricardo and the philosophies of Hegel and Aristotle. The conflict between Soviet communism and liberal democracy was not a clash between the west and rest. **It was a family quarrel among western ideologies"** (Gray 1999 pp. 101-102 emphasis added). **What makes the West a family is the espousal of the minimalist agenda of Negative freedom as the rejection of any external powers having normative authority over human beings and their affairs** (cf. Tucker 1964 and Blond 1998).

Marxism adheres to this minimalist agenda through its:

a) acceptance of freedom as a value.

b) Rejection of normative authority of external powers over human affairs.

This is possible because Marx like liberal thinkers was a legitimate heir to the tradition in European thought that spearheaded revolt against religion in Europe.

The above synoptic view of the Enlightenment conception of freedom gives us the context and the background against which we can reconstruct Foucault's conception of freedom.
The purpose of this chapter is to reconstruct Foucault's conception of freedom in detail and to work out its salient features and characteristics that differentiate it from the standard Enlightenment (particularly Kantian) conceptions of freedom.

1.2 Foucault and Freedom

Foucault's allegiance to Enlightenment and its concomitant belief in freedom is beyond any doubt. Foucault describes his project as "seeking to give a new impetus, as far and wide as possible to the undefined work of freedom" (FR p. 46). Foucault is one with Enlightenment thinkers in rejecting the normative power of any external authority over human affairs. Thus, he accepts Kant's definition of Enlightenment as "the moment when humanity is going to put its own reason for use, without subjugating itself to any authority …." (ibid. p. 37). Abandoning the normative power of external authorities over human affairs, and making use of reason mankind enters into a new period, which is described by Kant and Foucault as

Enlightenment. Enlightenment is a kind of maturity; because when mankind relied upon external authorities, it was immature like a child, who cannot use reason and looks to others for guidance. Thus describing Enlightenment and maturity with reference to Kant, Foucault writes approvingly that: "Kant indicates right away that the 'way out' that characterises Enlightenment is a process that releases us from the status of 'immaturity'. And by 'immaturity' he means a certain state of our will that makes us accept someone else's authority to lead in areas where the use of reason is called for" (ibid. p. 34). Foucault recognises the distinctive and unique character of the modern west and he is tied to its origin in the sense that he recognises the moment when 'the west first asserted the autonomy and sovereignty of its own rationality" (Foucault 1989 p. 10). He also recognises the moments that form the milestones of the west's march towards the establishment of the autonomy and sovereignty of its own rationality: "the Lutheran Reformation, the "Copernican Revolution", Cartesian philosophy, the Galilean mathematisation of nature, Newtonian physics" (ibid.). Foucault terms the announcement by the west of the autonomy and sovereignty of its own rationality as the 'founding' act of western civilisation. The founding act is allegiance to freedom. Relating to the founding act is however a continuous act in the sense that it requires analysis of the " 'present' moment . . . in terms of what was the history of this reason as well as of what can be its present balance, to look for the relation that must be established with this founding act: rediscovery, taking up a forgotten direction, completion or rupture, return to an earlier moment, etc." (ibid.). It is the latter element that distinguishes Foucault, from Kant and other Enlightenment thinkers. The Foucauldian enterprise is the self reflection of Enlightenment on its founding act and assessment of its present balance. It is in this sense that Foucault considers his work as the continuation of the work of Kant. Foucault considers Kant not as an Enlightenment thinker but a post Enlightenment thinker because Kant raises

for the first time the question of the possibility of Enlightenment. The question of the possibility of the sovereignty and autonomy of Western rationality: "for the first time rational thought was put in question not only as to its nature, its foundation, its powers and its insights, but also as to its history and its geography; as to its immediate past and its present reality; as to its time and its place" (ibid. p. 9). This question of post Enlightenment according to Foucault takes different forms in Germany and France. In Germany its "privileged moment" is "the Reformation; and a central problem: religious experience in its relation with the economy and the state" (ibid. p. 10). While in France it takes the form of reflection on "the history of science" (ibid.). Although these two types of queries take different forms they address the same question. The possibility of the sovereignty and autonomy of reason and its present balance: "And (though), the styles are quite different: the ways of dong things, the domains treated, but in the end both pose the same kind of questions, even if here they are haunted by the memory of Descartes, there by the ghost of Luther" (ibid. p. 11)[7]. The names of Descartes and Luther are revealing because they are essential figures and their thought crucial in breaking the dominance of Catholic/Orthodox/traditional Christian theology and the Christian worldview. Descartes[8] and Luther[9] are essential figures in the West's break with God and its announcement of the new deity, man as having a sovereign and autonomous reason and hence freedom to determine his life without intervention of Transcendent Will.

1.3 Foucault and Negative freedom

Foucault's conception of freedom is innovative in the sense that he argues for two essentially communitarian premises on liberal grounds while avoiding the standard liberal criticisms against the commuritarian conception of freedom. Thus Foucault argues that:

a) A minimalist conception of a specific reconstitution of the web of relations is necessary even for the realisation of Negative freedom. This paves the way for the development of a minimalist conception of Positive freedom on liberal grounds.

b) Foucault makes the vital distinction between Negative freedom in the factual and normative sense on commuritarian lines but on liberal grounds. Foucault argues on the basis of his relational ontology that the liberal conception of the atomistic self is not tenable on factual grounds. However Foucault is able to preserve the individualism of the liberal tradition by making the aforementioned distinction between the Negative freedom as value and Negative freedom as fact.

In this context I have tried to reconstruct Foucault's conception of Negative freedom by considering two received interpretations of Foucault's conception of Negative freedom and their shortcomings. Since these interpretations are largely implicit in the commentaries and no where elaborated I have had to argue for both the positions before pointing out their shortcomings. In the second section I present my own interpretation of Foucault's conception of Negative freedom. In section three and four I consider implication of Foucault's rejection of knowledge and morality as the means to freedom for his conception of Negative freedom. Section three and four, supplement discussion in section two.

1.3 (i) Two Senses of Negative Freedom in Foucault

Foucault's conception of Negative freedom may be interpreted in two different ways. To understand this we raise a further question; was Foucault a liberal or a communitarian[10]? The liberals believe in the desirability of the freedom of individual, freedom being understood in the negative sense. The liberal idea of freedom is an idea of indeterminacy of individual from without. An individual is free if any body/any thing other than himself does not determine him. But a further distinction is to be made here. The freedom of the individual can be viewed from two perspectives. First it can be viewed from the perspective of facticity, from the perspective whether an individual is free as a matter of fact or not. The second perspective views freedom as a value, whether an individual, views freedom as something desirable for its own sake. It can be the case that a person is free as a matter of fact but he does not desire or accept freedom as a motive. Instead, he chooses to surrender himself to an external will. It can also be the case that an individual is not free as a matter of fact but he desires to be free not just factually but normatively as well. In this case, he would struggle to overcome his factual bondage[11]. Thus, factual freedom is the necessary but not sufficient condition of freedom in the value sense. To be free in this normative liberal sense one needs factual freedom, and consider freedom as of intrinsic value. Thus for the actualisation of the liberal conception of freedom it is necessary to analyse the environment which contextualises the individual. This includes the whole set of relations at the societal and state level. The analysis of the situation is necessary for the actualisation/practice of freedom and the idea of Negative freedom would vary according to the conceptions of the factual situation. The idea

of Negative freedom is very much dependent on the nature of the analysis of the factual situation.

We can make a similar distinction with regard to communitarians. The communitarians see it as desirable to define and situate the individual self in relation to and in the context of the totality of the set of relations that constitute the self. The communitarians redefine Negative freedom as freedom of the community from transcendental authorities. They define freedom in the positive sense, as situating oneself in constituted by the larger self, community, or nation[12]. A further distinction to be made is this: communitarian freedom can also be seen either in the sense of factual freedom or as a value; although the distinction is more nuanced compared to the liberal notion.

The factual situation of self in the context of the web of relations that constitute/contextualise the self can provoke several responses. One may want to transcend the web of relations as such. This is the liberal attitude in this context. On the other hand one may not want to transcend the web of relations as such but to reconstitute them in the manner that enhance the freedom of the self. This is value communitarianism. Thus a liberal may find himself situated in the reconstituted web of relations so that he is free in the factual sense but he may not want to be situated in a particular socio- community context. Thus he is free in the communitarian sense but does not desire freedom in this sense so that he is free in the factual communitarian sense but rejects his community situation. This differentiates the liberal perception of freedom as value from the communitarian perception where rejecting one's community is not regarded as either a possibility or (necessarily) a value (Taylor 1989)

Thus when we raise the question whether Foucault is a liberal or a communitarian we are raising a question, which has potentially, more than two answers. Speaking speculatively Foucault can be a liberal in the value sense, but he may be a communitarian in the factual sense. Similarly he may be a communitarian in the value sense but a liberal in the factual sense.

The belief in Negative freedom can be interpreted in two ways. It can be interpreted in the sense of **complete** indeterminacy[13]. The notion of complete indeterminacy is compatible with the Kantian idea of pure practical reason, which is a spontaneous act, not determined by anything but itself. However, no one today believes in Kant's notion of reason[14]. Reason is considered to be constituted by and hence determined by history, language, culture etc. In such a situation, the idea of complete indeterminacy seems not only utopian but also essentially incompatible with the real position of human beings in this world.

Foucault's idea of Negative freedom can be interpreted in the sense of complete indeterminacy; especially his earlier work is more liable to be interpreted in this way. The essential term in this interpretation is transgression, which Foucault borrows from Bataille. "Transgression" designates and affirms two aspects of our being in the world. Firstly it affirms our essential finitude or in other words, "it affirms the limited being". On the other hand it affirms, "limitlessness into which it [limited being] leaps" (Foucault 1977 pp. 34-35) after its denial to succumb to any limit imposed on it from without. According to this interpretation Foucault agrees with the Kantian notion of Negative freedom as complete indeterminacy but his analysis of the factual situation is different from that of Kant. Pure practical reason might be a pure spontaneity but in Foucault's conception, it is not located in some transcendental ivory tower. On the contrary, it is engulfed in finitude and limitations.

According to this conception then the realisation of freedom can't just be a question of the recognition of the spontaneity of pure practical reason. The task of freedom is above all the task of transgression, permanent unfinished struggles to go beyond finitude and limitations: "the task is to transform the critique conducted in the form of necessary limitation into a practical critique that takes the form of a possible transgression (FR p. 45).

If the present world is an administered world, if reason is implicated in the mechanisms of power, then the negative task of transgressing the totalising administrative cage of the mechanisms of power and limitations becomes naturally foremost. Foucault's description of his work as a permanent critique and hyperactive pessimism (ibid. p. 343) give credence to this interpretation. Also relevant here is Foucault's term 'originary (**originaire**) experience'. The task of this experience is total transformation: a totally different relation with reality, with knowledge, with thought, with others and with one's self; "an alteration, a transformation, of the relation we have with ourselves and our cultural universe: in a word, with our knowledge (**savoir**)" (RM p. 37). Foucault uses a wide array of terms to denote totality of such a transformation like, alteration, metamorphosis, limit experience, tearing the self from self etc. Freedom requires the dismantling of object and subject. This important aspect of Foucault's thought, which is indispensable for understanding his notion of freedom, has been obscured by undue emphasis on the subject side of his critique. To dismantle object is to "establish (a) new relation with what (is) at issue" (ibid. p. 34). To dismantle object is "a transformation of the relation (marked historically, theoretically, and also from the ethical point of view) which we ourselves have with madness, the institution of psychiatry, and the "truth" of that discourse" (ibid. pp. 35-36). Dismantling object is necessary because if 'object' is permanent then it determines us, we do not determine it. Dismantling object is the exercise of freedom, and in this sense Foucault contends that "Each of my books is a way of

dismantling an object, and of constructing a method of analysis towards it" (ibid. p.28). It is the question of relating to those supposedly permanent objects in a way so that they no longer hold a sway over us, and transforming them and ourselves at the same time so that a new relation can be established between a newly formed 'us' and newly formed 'objects'. This is a permanent exercise, the exercise of limitless freedom. Thus we can live our Enlightenment only by modifying it: "What links us to our modernity (is) at the same time (that which) will make it appear modified to us" (ibid. p. 38). Thus Foucault asks that his books should be read "as an experience that changes us, that prevents us form always being the same, or from having the same kind of relation with things and with others that we had before reading it" (ibid. p.41). The need to change arises because of our desire for freedom, if we remain the same or if the things around us remain the same we can not exercise freedom. That is why the urge for freedom for Foucault is a form of hyperactivisim or what he alternatively calls limit experience: "the point of life lies as close as possible to the impossibility of living, which lies at the limit or extreme" (ibid. p. 31). The act of transformation and dismantling of object requires dismantling of subject as well: "the task of "tearing" the subject from itself in such a way that it is no longer the subject as such, or that it is completely "other" than itself so that it may arrive at its annihilation, its dissociation. It is this de-subjectifying undertaking, the idea of a "limit-experience" that tears the subject from itself, which is the fundamental lesson that I've learned from these authors (Nietzsche, Bataille, and Blanchot). And no matters how boring and erudite my resulting books have been, this lesson has always allowed me to conceive them as direct experiences to "tear" me from myself, **to prevent me from always being the same**" (ibid. pp. 31-32 emphasis added). Thus it would seem that change even for the sake of change would be desirable in Foucault's view, as it is the only way freedom becomes possible in an administered world[15].

The transformation of fundamental experience of reality and self and their relation, which results in the transgression from the exiting reality, is the only possibility of freedom. Once the change has occurred that primordial experience ceases to remain primordial and it takes the form of norm in the limitless sea of sameness. Hence a need for a new revolution[16] a need for a new primordial experience. History according to this account seems to be a swing between the possibilities of primordial experience and tyranny of sameness and norms. Sameness becomes synonymous to tyranny in Foucault. It would seem that Foucault tries to escape the tyranny of sameness by accepting the tyranny of freedom. Thus the new regime of knowledge Foucault once heralded in **The Order of Things** (Foucault 1970) for example, did not constitute a higher order of truth, it would pass away like other orders melted away in the boiling pot of history. Its dawn was anticipated and heralded by Foucault with such passion and vigour because it represented emancipation (even if temporary) from the tyranny of the modern notion of "Subject", the subject whose very structure was woven with the fabrics of sameness. It is in this context that Foucault speaks of the death of man in the memorable final lines of **The Order of Things:**

> ". . . among all the mutations that has affected the knowledge of things and their order, the knowledge of identities, difference, character, equivalencies, words-in short, in the midst of all the episodes of that profound history of the Same-only one, that which began a century and a half ago and is now perhaps drawing to a close, has made it possible for the figure of man to appear. And the appearance is not the liberation of an old anxiety, the transition into luminous consciousness of an age-old concern, the entry into objectivity of something that had long remained trapped within beliefs and philosophies: it was the effect of a change in the fundamental arrangement of knowledge. As the archaeology of our thought easily shows, man is rather invention of recent date. And one perhaps nearing its end" (pp. 386-387).

That is why history is so important for Foucault. It heralds a way out of the tyranny of the same.

Foucault's notion of Negative freedom on the other hand, especially in his later work, has also been interpreted quite differently. This interpretation takes its basic clue from Foucault's rejection of the so called repressive hypotheses in the first volume of the **History of Sexuality** (HS pp. 17-49 and passim). It is argued that "Foucault's point was to show us that we are 'freer than we think we are' (Bell 1996 p. 83). According to this interpretation Foucault's attack on psychoanalytic thought and radical politics was that they "lead us to conceptualise our freedom as curtailed or repressed, such that true freedom becomes figured as the totalised breaking out of a current state of repression or oppression, and as absence of any determinacy. But such a zero sum conception of power is one that has limited our political visions, directing them away from the possibilities of the present and on to the hope of some future radical change" (ibid.). This interpretation differs from the first in its conception of freedom and in its analysis of the situation. The difference in the analysis of the situation boils down to difference as to the nature of power.

Let us consider the question first with reference to the significance of the repressive hypothesis[17], and radical political philosophy so as to understand Foucault's conception of power with reference to this reading. The repressive hypothesis is unacceptable because it considers power only in negative terms, in terms of prohibition. The repressive hypothesis ignores the fact that modern bio and disciplinary power is not just a negative, repressive force but also a positive, productive liberating force.[18]

To understand Foucault's notion of power it is essential to understand that in Foucauldian ontology relations are primary and they are essentially formed at the prediscursive level (at

the level of practice). Subject and object are constituted through relations. Different kinds of relations constitute different kinds of subjects and objects. The universe is essentially a process but a structured process. Human history is the history of structures and transformations. Structures represent stability and continuity while transformation is the possibility of change and alteration. Thus there are no eternal subjects, or eternal objects, only practices exist. Different practices create different subjects and different objects. With change in practices subjects and objects change[19].

Fundamental for Foucault are two types of practices viz.: practices of freedom and practices of subjection. The first constitutes the autonomous subject while the second constitutes the subjugated subject[20]. Both exist side by side. In this sense there is no sovereign subject and there is no subject which is out of the web of determination altogether: ". . . there is no sovereign, founding subject, a universal form of subject to be found everywhere . . . I believe, on the contrary, that the subject is constituted through practices of subjection, or, in a more autonomous way, through practices of liberation, of liberty, as in Antiquity, on the basis, of course, of a number of rules, styles, inventions to be found in the cultural environment" (PPC pp. 50-51). Thus power relations are not all pervasive in the sense that there is always room for the constitution of subject as autonomous subject amidst the practices of subjection.

This is possible because Foucault does not oppose power to freedom. Power is one kind of relation while freedom is another kind of relation. According to Foucault power "is the mode of action on the action of others" in the sense that its purpose is "to structure the field of possible actions of others". Hence viewed, power relations must form an integral part of any society and thus "there can be no society without power relations". Moreover power

and freedom far from being contrary concepts are prerequisites for each other. At least Foucault makes it explicit that power can only be exercised "over free subjects and only insofar as they are free" (SP p. 221). If power is the structuring of other's action it can only be possible if there is space (freedom) for such a structuring. Thus Foucault explicitly rejects the 'zero sum conception of power'[21]:

> "Relations of power are not something bad in themselves, from which one must free one's self. I don't believe there can be a society without relations of power, if you understand them as means by which individuals try to conduct, to determine the behaviour of others. The problem is not of trying to dissolve them in the utopia of a perfectly transparent communication, but to give one's self the rules of law, the techniques of management, and also the ethics, ethos, the practice of self, which would allow these games of power to be played with a minimum of domination" (1987 p. 129).

Consequently the second interpretation is different in conception of freedom from that of the first interpretation. Here freedom is not conceptualised as 'totalised breaking out' and **complete** indetermination. Distinction has been made between factual limitations, and normative limitations. The pursuit of freedom is seen as necessarily situated in context, within limitations and determinations.

There is no doubt a basis for both types of interpretations in Foucault's work. However any viable account of Foucault's conception of Negative freedom must combine the valid points of the two interpretations into a single organic whole. But for this we need to consider the salient shortcomings of the two interpretations mentioned above.

First let us consider the second interpretation. The first shortcoming of this interpretation is that its rejection of first interpretation as aiming at the 'totalised breaking out' is not nuanced enough. It either confuses or does not sufficiently differentiate the two different senses of the 'totalised breaking out' which may not necessarily have to be conceived in exclusive terms. A

'totalised breaking out' in the moral sense might be pursued without necessarily adhering to 'totalised breaking out' in the factual sense.

The second pitfall of the second interpretation is that it misinterprets the meaning of Foucault's rejection of the repressive hypothesis and consequently downplays the empancipatory zeal of Foucault's enterprise. By rejecting the repressive hypothesis it was not Foucault's intention to deny misery and repression in capitalism. Far form it. What Foucault was trying to reject by the rejection of the repressive hypothesis was the totally negative conception of power where power is conceived simply in negative terms as a limiting, repressing, force. Foucault on the contrary emphasised that power should be seen as a productive force and limitation and saying 'no' as only its terminating point. But the mere fact that power is a potentially liberating force does not make it an empancipatory tool. On the contrary it can be a more appalling tool of repression and curtailment of freedom. Curtailment of freedom through freedom. Foucault explains this point by contrasting his view with that of Marx:

> "Capitalism's raison d'être is not to starve the workers but it cannot develop without starving them. Marx replaced the denunciation of theft by the analysis of production.
>
> Other things being equal, that is approximately what I wanted to say. It is not a matter of denying sexual misery, nor is it however one of explaining it negatively by a repression. The entire problem is to grasp the positive mechanism which, producing sexuality in this or that fashion, results in misery" (PPC p. 113).

Thus Foucault didn't say that we are 'freer them we think we are' to mean that the web of determinations are less formidable then we think they are; what Foucault meant by saying this was that the web of determinations and limitations in capitalist societies is sustained

through freedom and not through (primarily) curtailment and that the general form of control in modern societies is management and not curtailment.

The third pitfall of the second interpretation is that it confuses Foucault's point that relations of 'power are not necessarily relations of domination'. The level of domination in a society is determined by the totality of relationships and their overall balance.

There are two legitimate concerns about the first interpretation too. There is the danger that Negative freedom would be considered as simply an 'exit' and 'way out'. Foucault brings out the possibility of this danger in his criticism of liberation movements. The idea of 'Liberation' presupposes suppression and prohibition. To think of power as pure limit set on freedom leads to the notion that freedom consists in merely lifting this prohibition: a 'way out'. But these notions are dangerous in the context of the workings of modern power, which does not work by 'starving' desire but prospers on creating, inducing and multiplying and through ramification of desire. "This type of discourse", is a dangerous according to Foucault and "a formidable tool of control and power. As always, it uses what people say, feel and hope for. It exploits their temptation to believe that to be happy, it is enough to cross the threshold of discourse and remove a few prohibitions. But in fact it ends up dispersing movements of revolt and liberation" (PPC p. 114 cf. HS pp. 3-35).

This simplistic notion of Negative freedom as simply an 'exit' is based on the negative conception of power which Foucault has taken great pains to reject

The second danger related to the first interpretation is that the 'totalised breaking out' be taken in factual terms. Then freedom would be seen as an aspiration to transcend limitation and determination as such. This simplistic view of freedom is based on naivety that there is a

possibility of transcending all limitations and determinations. Kant's Kingdom of End, Hegel's end of history, and Marx's communism and other utopias of nineteenth and early twentieth century may be interpreted as expression of this naïve hope about the arrival of a period when all limitations would be lifted and nothing would remain opaque and everything would become transparent, when human being would be able to realise their true potential for freedom. However Post Enlightenment thinking no longer harbours such hopes due to reasons already registered sufficiently in modernity postmodernity debate (cf. Bernstein 1996, William 1978).

1.3 (ii) Foucault's Conception of Negative Freedom

A new (positive) stance towards finitude is required to conceive of the possibility of freedom. For Foucault, in contrast to Enlightenment thinkers like Kant, freedom is not the opposite of determination and limitation as such. For Kant freedom meant negation (or transcendence) of limitation and finitude as such. For Foucault on the contrary freedom is possible only because of human finitude and limitations. Transcendence is possible. We are speaking here of two different conceptions of finitude. (a) The Kantian conception in which finitude makes freedom possible but only in the negative sense, in the sense in which the finite is the condition of the possibility of the infinite. (b) The Foucauldian conception on the other hand portrays finitude in the positive sense, in the sense in which finitude provides the basis for transcendence in the sense that it emanates from within finitude. Foucault raises the possibility and desirability of the "critique of finitude which would be liberating with respect to both man and the infinite, and which shows that finitude is not an end, but the curve and knot of time in which the end is beginning" (cited in Macey 1994 p. 89). This conception of

finitude entails inevitable finitude and ‘particularity’ of reason. Finitude of and ‘particularity’ of reason is the condition of the possibility freedom.

The difference between the two conceptions boils down ultimately to two different conceptions of being in the world. Kant's and Hegel's conception of man was of a being not from this world but 'thrown' into this world of constraints and limitations. Limitations and finitude were considered to be essentially alien to the essence of human beings. Foucault's conception of man on the other hand consists in considering man as a creature of this world through and through without any trace of any other world. Agamben's following comments make the contrast very clear. Commenting on Foucault's notion of man as historical being Agamben writes: "man is not a historical being because he falls into time, but precisely the opposite; it is only because he is a historical being that he can fall into time, temporasing himself" (Agamben 1993 p. 99). Thus time and space are not the limits on a being whose essences is a-temporal and a-spacious but part and parcel of a being which is temporal and spacious.

Due to this new conception of finitude Negative freedom as a ‘way out’ ceases to be a sufficient criterion of the performance of freedom, simply because there is no 'way out' in absolute terms. Positive self-constitution on permanent basis becomes necessary even for the fulfilment of negative liberty as freedom ‘from’. Thus Foucault argues for a certain positive conception of freedom (to be elaborated in a due course) entirely on liberal grounds. Foucault conceives Negative freedom as ‘way out’ and permanent positive self-constitution as essential ingredients of freedom ‘from’. This is another way of saying that for Foucault commitment to Negative freedom emanates from and presupposes an ethos, a subjectivity, so that considerations of Negative freedom can not be separated from considerations of Positive

freedom. As Kritzman puts it commenting on Foucault's ambivalent attitude towards the Gay movement: "Gay sexuality is to be thought of as a dynamic mode in which the refusal of a more traditional lifestyle (Negative freedom!) emanates from a sexual choice that transforms one's own mode of being (Positive freedom). . . . " (Kritzman 1988 p. xiii)[22].

As mentioned earlier, Foucault differentiates between fact and value by differentiating between relations that are morally relevant and those, which are not. Thus he can reject the liberal atomistic conception of self by showing how subjects are constituted by power games but this remains a factual analysis and is not incompatible with his conception of Negative freedom as absence of determinacy. Foucault rejects the 'zero sum conception of power' by rejecting the liberal analysis of the factual position of the self in this world by situating self not beyond any determination but at the heart of limitations and determinations. Thus, Foucault may be termed a communitarian as far as his analysis of the real world situation is concerned and as far as he situates the moral self within the transient world of limitations and determinations. Nevertheless, he remains liberal as far as his normative conception is concerned and as far as his conception of Negative freedom is concerned.

Foucault situates the quest for indeterminacy within determination. Indeterminacy is not imposed on and is not an escape from determination. It emanates from the situatedness and embededdness in the life world. Thus Foucault retains the belief in liberal rejection of the determination of self from without but he does not see this quest as the quest for absolute indetermination. The quest for absolute indetermination consists in confusing Negative freedom as the analysis of the factual situation and Negative freedom as a normative ideal. The Enlightenment and the modernist picture of the self as presented by Kant situates the self apart from and distinct from the world so it is absolutely free in the factual sense. The

realisation of freedom consists in either the realisation of this fact or in the imposition of rational (free) self on sensual (unfree) self or on the natural (unfree) world. In Foucault on the other hand, the self is not absolutely free in the factual sense. Foucault does not consider all factual determinations as contrary to freedom in the negative sense: hence his differentiation between power and domination. Not every power relation entails domination and curtailment of freedom. Freedom in the normative sense consists not in denying and trying to escape out of every kind of determination and aspiring towards complete (factual) indeterminacy but in differentiating what kind of determination is morally acceptable and what kind of determination is not[23].

For Foucault not all limitations and determinations are morally relevant. Foucault seeks complete indetermination only from those limitations and determinations that are morally unacceptable. This is evident from his differentiation between forms of power, which are not domination and the forms of power, which are. Not all power relations are intolerable, not all relations are contrary to freedom.

Foucault differentiates, in the Kantian manner, between the subject of knowledge and the ethical subject. The subject of knowledge, as such is not the domain of freedom. Thus to speak of freedom in the domain of the subject of knowledge is irrelevant as the relations that constitute knowledge, are not as such relevant to the question of freedom. The domain of the ethical subject is the domain of freedom and here the question of freedom is relevant. In this context Foucault differentiates between 'knowledge' (**savoir**) and '**a** knowledge' (**connaissance**). **Savoir** " is the process through which the subject finds himself modified by what he knows, or rather by the labour performed in order to know. It is what permits the modification of the subject and the construction of the object" (RM pp. 69-70). The subject

of **savoir** is the ethical subject in the sense that it is the space of freedom, the arena of pure possibility, which is the very condition of the possibility of **connaissance. Connaissance** "is the process which permits the multiplication of knowable objects, the development of their intelligibility, the understanding of their rationality, while the subject doing the investigation always remains the same" (p. 70). The subject of **connaissance** is theoretical subject and it remains the same not because it is a universal subject but because its fixity is a temporal necessity. The space between the subject of **savoir** and the subject of **connaissance** is the space of freedom. But this freedom is not absolute, it is limited. These limitations are historical not necessary limitations of universal reason and hence transcendable. Thus transformation through revolution is never absolute in the sense that the 'originary gesture', the radical experience does not entail absolute freedom in the factual sense: hence the rejection of any utopia. **Savoir** refers to pure possibility, emptiness that is the precondition of all discourses, actions and relations. Foucault refers to this phenomenon interchangeably through his notion of thought. This is the domain of factual freedom and hence morally relevant and in this sense Foucault claims that this freedom is the ontological condition of ethics. (Foucault 1987 p. 115) Thought and **Savoir** are the condition of all possibilities and hence of ethics as the 'deliberate form taken by freedom'. As Foucault puts it:

> "What distinguishes thought is that it is something quite different from the set of representations that underlies certain behaviour . . .Thought in not what inhabits a certain conduct and gives it its meaning; rather, it is what allows one to step back from this way of acting or reading, to present oneself as an object of thought and question its meaning, its conditions and its goals. **Thought is freedom in relation to what one does, the motion by which one detaches oneself from it, establishes it as an object and reflects on its problem**" (FR pp.388-389 emphasis added).

The 'function' of thought is transformation:

> Thought exists independently of systems and structures of discourse. It is something that is often hidden, but which always animates everyday behaviour. There is always a little thought even in the most stupid institutions; there is always thought even in silent habits.
>
> Criticism is a matter of flushing out that thought and trying to change it: to show that things are not as self-evident as one believed, to see that what is accepted as self-evident will no longer be accepted as such. Practicing criticism is a matter of making facile gestures difficult.
>
> In these circumstances, criticism (and radical criticism) is absolutely indispensable for any transformation. A transformation that remains within the same mode of thought, a transformation that is only a way of adjusting the same thought more closely to the reality of things can merely be a superficial transformation.
>
> On the other hand as soon as one can no longer think things as one formerly thought them, transformation becomes both every urgent, very difficult, and quite possible. It is not therefore a question of there being a time for criticism and a time for transformation, nor people who do the criticism and others who do the transforming, those who are enclosed in an inaccessible radicalism and those who are forced to make the necessary concessions to reality. In fact I think the work of deep transformation can only be carried out in a free atmosphere, one constantly agitated by a permanent criticism" (PPC p. 155).

Thought makes possible the limit attitude which “has to be conceived of as an attitude, an ethos, a philosophical life in which the critique of what we are is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits that are imposed upon us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them” (FR p. 50). The purpose of genealogy according to Foucault is the same, it “is not the erecting of the foundation: on the contrary, it disturbs what was previously considered as immobile; it fragments what was thought unified; it shows the heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself” (ibid. p. 82).

But the outcome of this transformation is not to be understood in terms of the creation of a limitless and sructureless ideal type sans limitations, where there is complete indeterminacy.

On the contrary for Foucault the search for freedom in the moral sense is itself a structured endeavour, what he calls ‘a patient labour giving form to our impatience for liberty’ (ibid. p. 50).

The practice of liberty does not entail complete transcendence of reality but on the contrary it is “an exercise in which extreme attention to what is real is confronted with the practice of liberty that simultaneously respects this reality and violates it” (ibid. p. 41).

Let us elaborate a bit further on this to arrive at a fuller articulation of Foucault's conception of negative liberty.

As mentioned above for Foucault relations and practices are primary, individuations and collectivisation are secondary. They are formed through relations. Relations are prediscursive; relations are always structured but their context is pure possibility, which is the condition of the existence and formation of relations. Through relations objects and subjects are formed both individual and collective. When relations change their pattern or when practices alter new subjectivities and objectivities are formed and the old are destroyed, changed, reconstituted. This is the process of transformation. Foucault brings forth the primacy of relations by contrasting ‘the way of acting and doing and saying things’ with representational knowledge and knowledge of absolute limits that encircle us. Foucault sees himself as dealing essentially with ‘what we do and the way we do it’ and 'what we say and the way we say it'; and this is what he calls practice and it includes discursive and nondiscursive practices alike.

Foucault is concerned with two aspects of ‘what way we do and the way we do it’ First, the ‘forms of the rationality that organise’ our different ways of doing what we do and the way

we do what we do. This is the technological aspect of the practices, the rationalities that govern different practices. The combination of any given practices is termed by Foucault as practical system. The second aspect which Foucault intends to study regarding practices is 'the freedom with which" we can act 'within (the) practical systems". These are the two relevant aspects, which circumscribe any search for Negative freedom.

Our existing practical systems form the background and necessary anchorage for our search for freedom. There can be no sense in seeking freedom outside the practical systems in which we exist. Although there is always a possibility of transformation of one practical system to another and it may be the case that one practical system has more room for freedom than the other. This 'possibility of freedom' aspect of a practical system is termed by Foucault as the strategic aspect of practical system (FR p. 48).

Let us try to understand the point made above with respect to practical system in terms of Foucault's conception of relations.

Foucault mentions three fundamental relations that we come across in human societies. Knowledge relations, which Foucault term as 'relations of control over thing' (which includes truth relations)[24]. Power relations, or what Foucault calls 'relations of action upon actions of others' (including state and institutional relations)[25] Ethical relations or the relation between self and self, 'relations with oneself'[26]. These relations do not exist separate from each other but are necessarily connected to and enmeshed in each other: "there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (DP p. 27). The "control over things is mediated by relations with others; and relations with others in turn always entail relations with oneself, and vice versa" (FR p. 48).

We can note several points regarding Foucault's conceptions of relations and their bearings on his conception of Negative freedom viz:

- If every society consists of a web of relations Negative freedom can not be conceived of as complete indetermination implying both factual and normative indetermination.

- If the relational is prior to individuation Foucault can not ascribe to the liberal conception of the atomistic self and the self must be seen as constituted by different relations and their interrelation.

- Thus the search for the autonomy of self must be situated within the web of relations.

- If the web of relations is a necessary element in the constitution of individuality then some minimum condition as to how relations are to be constituted is a must for the realisation of Negative freedom. A certain conception of Positive freedom is indispensable for the realisation of Negative freedom: the reason being that the notion of self sufficiency can only have sense in conditions where the individual can be conceived as standing prior to and outside the web of relations.

Thus we reach the same conclusion within the context of Foucault's conception of relations that we reached in the context of his conception of practical systems. The search for Negative freedom for Foucault can not be the search for transcending the web of relations as such. It must be situated in the context of the individual situation in this web.

We have noted above two axis of Foucault’s analysis of freedom. First Foucault starts with the notion of a self, which is conceived and constituted in the context of a web of preexisting relations. Thus Foucault rejects the atomistic notion of self, espoused by the liberal thinkers. He also rejects the notion that self is situated beyond the natural world and the world of

limitations and determinations. Thus Foucault's analysis starts with an embodied and embedded conception of the self, somewhat similar to the notion of the self, espoused by communitarian thinkers. Foucault brings out this clearly when he writes that "(there) is not a single culture in the world where everything is permitted. And we have known for a long time that humanity does not start out from freedom but from limitation and the line not to be crossed" (Foucault 1997 p. 100). But Foucault does not take this as given and unchangeable. On the contrary Foucault sees the self as constituted and deconstructed simultaneously in the course of history. There is no single self or single soul. There is always the possibility of many subjects, many souls and many selves. Thus a certain conception of subject may be the condition of the possibility of experience at any given time in history, it is not the end of the game in the sense that this subject was itself constituted by certain originary experiences which tested the limits of some other subjectivity at some other point in history. Thus for Foucault subject is not the absolute limit of experience, or in other words there is always the possibility of freedom: "It is experience which is the rationalisation of a process, itself provisional, which results in a subject, or rather, in subjects. I will call subjectivization the procedure by which one obtains the constitution of a subject, or more precisely, of a subjectivity which is of course only one of the given possibilities of organisation of a self consciousness" (PPC p. 253). This means that the quest for freedom takes place in a background that is not absolute, yet cannot be totally transcended in two fundamental senses. First it must be the background from which one starts the quest for freedom, even when one is bracketing it, problematising it, questioning it. Second it can not be replaced by a totally transparent system, which is limitless. It can only be replaced by new limits, new forms of determinations, and new power knowledge games. This is the factual axis of Foucault's analysis. It has some limited affinities with the communitarians. The second axis of analysis

may be termed as the value axis. Here the question is not of facticity but of desirability. What does Foucault seek? Freedom of the individual is the only answer. Freedom from what? Freedom from limitations, domination, determinations. In this sense Foucault is a liberal but with the provision that he does not think that all limitations and determinations are either transcendable or even that this transcendence is desirable and with the provision that he sees Negative freedom as 'way out' as insufficient even useless and dangerous unless it is followed by positive 'autonomous' self constitution. A certain form of Positive freedom is necessary even for the realisation of Negative freedom. Although as we shall see below Foucault's conception of Positive freedom is thin enough to be justifiably exemptable from the liberal critique of Positive freedom in general[27].

What Foucault calls the limit attitude consists of discerning the necessary from the contingent limits and assessing the possibility of going beyond, of transformation and hence of freedom (FR pp. 45-46).

Necessity is of two types in Foucault: absolute and historical. Absolute necessity consists of the factual limits which can not be transcended like the fact that human beings are relational being; This can not be wished away. Historical necessity on the other hand is transcendable in principle. It is only necessary till it is our present. All particular specific relational regimes i.e. power knowledge and ethical regimes are necessary only in the historical sense. Historical necessity is the arena of freedom. It is the necessity whose limits are to be tested permanently and this is the essence of limit attitude.

The question of freedom hinges on discerning "the 'contemporary limits of the necessary' that is, toward what is not or is no longer indispensable for the constitution of ourselves as autonomous subjects" (ibid. p. 44). How to discern indispensable limits from dispensable

limits? How to know which limits yet remain tolerable from what are no longer tolerable? Foucault's answer is simple; personal experience. An "experience that might permit an alteration, a transformation, of the relation we have with ourselves and our cultural universe: in a word with our knowledge (**savoir**)". (RM p. 37). But its being personal experience does not make it exclusive; it is accessible to others: "it is necessary to clear the way for a transformation, a metamorphosis which isn't simply **individual** but which has a character accessible to others: that is, this experience must be linkable, to a certain extent, to a collective practice and to a way of thinking. This is how it happened, for example, for such movements as anti-psychiatry, or the prisoners' movements in France" (ibid. pp. 38-39). What links the personal experience to the possibility of 'collective practice' is the shared horizon, the shared ethos, the shared way of being, and acting, in short shared aspirations. In this context personal experiences "function as invitations, as public gestures, for those who may want eventually to do the same thing, or something like it, or, in any case, who intend to slip into this kind of experience" (ibid. p. 40).

This **discontent** with the present relational regime and the urge to go beyond, however, is empty if it is not supplemented by the positive constitution of a new relational regime, a new self to self relation, a new knowledge relation, a new power relation and a new mode of interrelation among their relational web and its new balance. Without this new reconstitution of Negative freedom remains an empty slogan. The reason for this is that human societies can never be void of relational regimes and if a new set of relations does not emerges one would necessarily fall back to the same existing relations since there is no other place to stand.

1.3(iii) Negative Freedom and Morality[28]

It is evident from the above that Foucault shares the Enlightenment rejection of external authorities as having normative power over human beings. In fact, Foucault's rejection of any external normative power over human affairs is more vehement than e.g. Kant in the sense that he develops his critique of the early versions of modernism on the basis that they did not take this principle seriously. Thus he differentiates between modernism and maturity. Modernism consisted in the great transformation where by Western humanity abandoned its belief in the normative authority of God over human affairs. This negative achievement of Enlightenment and modernism is the basis of any subsequent development in this way but this negative "achievement" cannot be taken as self-sufficient in itself. The negative "achievement" of Enlightenment can be lost by creating new gods, creating new authorities in the place of God[29]. According to Foucault Kant did exactly this. He rejected the normative power of God over human beings but replaced it with a new 'god', the transcendental subjectivity or 'good will'. Thus according to Foucault Kant was modern but not sufficiently mature because "He historically faced the loss of the grounding of human action in metaphysical reality, but he sought to reground it in epistemology" (Hoy 1986 p. 118).

The distinguishing characteristic of Foucault's thought is precisely this fact that he takes Enlightenment's quest for the rejection of any external normative authority over human affairs seriously and espouses it with all its logical entailments: "there (is) one thing that distinguishes Foucault's thought from that of some others, it is the firm resolve not to serve a dual function, not to reduplicate our illusions, not to prove that what is, ought to be (and) has every reason to be. The rarest of phenomenon, here is a philosophy without a happy end. Not that it ends badly: nothing can "end", since there is no end point any more than there is an origin. Foucault's originality among the great thinkers of our century (lies) in his refusal to convert our finitude into the basis for new certainties" (Veyne 1997b p. 229).

One way to understand Foucault's notion of Negative freedom further is to look at his rejection of the notion of morality. Foucault considers the Christian notion of morality as the negation of the concept of freedom. It is seen as a form of subjugation that was introduced in Western culture by Christianity. Before the advent of Christianity, in the European cultures of Rome and Greece morality meant " a personal work of art, even if it obeyed certain collective cannons", but "with Christianity, there occurred a slow, gradual shift in relation to the moralities of Antiquity . . . ." Foucault describes this slow gradual shift in the following words: " . . . in Christianity, with the religion of the text, the idea of the will of God, the principle of obedience, morality took in increasingly the form of a code of rules". The change from antiquity to Christianity consisted in a change from "a personal ethics to a morality as obedience to a system of rules" (PPC p. 49)[30]. Although Enlightenment rejected the idea of obedience to rules promulgated by or in the name of God, it puts forth its own idea of obedience to rules promulgated by or in the name of transcendental subjectivity, man. Foucault considers this conception of morality as obedience to rules made by man as the reassertion of the Christian idea of morality in another guise. This is because the idea of a man made code of moral rules presupposes and requires that we attribute the idea of 'absolute will' to man. Thus although Enlightenment rejected the idea of obedience to the absolute will in the name of God, by attributing 'absolute will' to man, it internalised the concept of the Christian God, by locating Him within each man as his conscience to which he must submit in his quest for autonomy. The Foucauldian objection to the modern conception of morality is similar to the one made against Luther by Marx. Marx commenting on the change effected by Luther in European culture, writes: "Luther, without question, defeated servitude through devotion, but only by substituting servitude through conviction.

He shattered the faith in authority, by restoring the authority of faith . . . He freed man from external religiosity by making religiosity the innermost essence of the man" (1963 p. 53).

Foucault's critique of the Christian and Enlightenment (Kantian) conceptions of morality is clearly based on his firm belief, which he shares with Enlightenment, in the illegitimacy and unacceptability of any external authority to have normative power over human affairs be this in the name of God or man. And Foucault notes joyfully that "the idea of morality as obedience to a code of rules is now disappearing, has already disappeared. And to this absence of morality corresponds, must correspond, the search for an aesthetic of existence" (PPC p. 49). The 'aesthetic', as we shall see is the preferred solution because it is the logical outcome of Enlightenment rejection of the normative power of external authorities over human affairs. The rejection of the Christian/Enlightenment conception of morality is the rejection of the hegemony of 'ought' over human beings: "The search for a form of morality acceptable to everybody in the sense that everyone should submit to it, strikes me as catastrophic" (ibid. pp. 53-254). Christianity taught succumbing to 'ought' because this 'ought' emanated from the 'absolute will' of God. With the rejection and relegation of Christianity to the sidelines, 'ought' ceased to emanate from 'absolute will'. However, Enlightenment invested and relocated this 'absolute will' inside each and every human being. The 'ought' remains in operation but it emanates now form the transcendental subjectivity of each human being. Enlightenment authors like Kant, considered this as the fulfilment of the dream of autonomy. Foucault considers this as the continuation of heteronomy albeit in a different guise, the guise of autonomy. In the wake of this the task of Negative freedom becomes not just the rejection of and denial of the normative power of Christianity and its associated institutions but the denial and rejection of modern forms of coercion. According to Foucault, however, all this is changing (due to widespread

acceptance of Postmodern ideas perhaps) [see PPC p. 50 and 265]. People are beginning to realise the full implications of the project of Enlightenment.

1.3(iv) Negative Freedom and Knowledge

As already alluded to, Foucault's commitment to the idea of Negative freedom takes the form of the rejection of the link between freedom and knowledge. How does knowledge, as a way to freedom constitute the negation of the idea of Negative freedom? The answer to this question lies in the Kantian rejection of natural law as the basis of morality. The basis of the Kantian rejection was the idea of autonomy. It is heteronomous and immoral for human beings to subject themselves to someone/something other than themselves. It is not only that subjugation to the will of God is heteronomous; subjection to objective universal laws is also heteronomous because when we subject ourselves to objective laws, or truth, something which we have not made ourselves, we commit the 'sin' of heteronomy. If rejection of natural law was the foremost contribution of Kant to moral theory, Foucault takes the implications of this rejection to its logical conclusion.

One of the great innovations of Kant was to distance ethics from knowledge. Medieval Christian philosophers linked ethics primarily to God's will. However, by this manoeuvre they restored the primacy of knowledge. God wills good because He knows the true nature of things. In modernist philosophy, this link between knowledge and ethics became increasingly pervasive. Progress in science gave rise to the belief that the scientific method could solve the whole range of human problems, including ethical ones. As Megill writes, "Central to the whole project of Enlightenment thought was the ambition to do for the human world what Newton had done for the natural world" (1985 p. 10). Even sceptics like Hume were convinced that they could arrive at the science of the mind, using Newton's method,

which would put an end to ethical and social controversies. In this context, Kant's attempt at making ethics autonomous was indeed significant and revolutionary. As he puts it: "I have therefore found it necessary to deny knowledge in order to make room for [moral and religious] faith" (Bxxx)[31]. As we know morality for Kant is nothing but autonomy, so we can reinterpret Kant's dictum as saying that it is necessary to deny knowledge in order to make autonomy possible. The denial of knowledge is the precondition of Negative freedom.

However, Kant's endeavour to distance ethics and knowledge was to a large extent a failure, and the 'will to truth' came to pervade the entire ethical realm. Now this all pervasiveness of the 'will to truth' to the extant that it has engulfed our whole ethical life (the life of freedom) is what seems to Foucault the most distressing element in modern times. Foucault does not deny the importance of the will to truth, but following Kant, he tries to persuade us that ethical questions and the question of freedom have no necessary and analytical link with knowledge, be it the knowledge of things, or desires or of our own nature. As Foucault puts it, "most of the people think if they do what they do, if they live as they live the **reason** is that they know the truth about desire, life, nature, body, and so on" (FR p. 350 emphasis added). But on the contrary, "My idea is that it is not at all **necessary** to relate ethical problems to scientific knowledge" (ibid.).

Foucault considers the ever growing normalisation of individuals and society as the direct result of this link between truth, knowledge and ethics. So he argues for a new ethics that is not based on knowledge:

> "most of us no longer believe that ethics is founded in religion, nor do we want legal systems to intervene in our moral, personal and private life. Recent liberation movements suffer from the fact that they can not find any principle on which to base the elaboration of new ethics. They need an

> ethics, but they cannot find any other ethics than an ethics founded on so called scientific knowledge of what self is, what desire is, what the unconscious is, and so on" (ibid. p. 343).

Foucauldian scepticism aims at limiting knowledge in this sense:

> "The only thing that I would not accept in the sceptical programme is the attempt the sceptics made to reach a certain number of results in a given order-because scepticism has never been total scepticism! It tried to raise problems in certain areas and to legitimate within other fields notions actually considered valid within other areas; secondly, it seems to me that for the sceptics, the ideal was to be optimists knowing relatively little about things, but knowing what they knew in a very secure and unimpeachable way. **Instead, what I am aiming for is a use of philosophy which may enable us to limit the areas of knowledge"** (PPC p. 254 emphasis added).

Truth, knowledge and rationality are necessary for the exercise of freedom but according to Foucault this necessity should not be analytical it should be instrumental. The relationship between truth and freedom should be an instrumental relationship; it should not be a relationship of analytical necessity. There is no analytic link between performance of freedom and truth, but knowledge can be an instrument for the achievement of freedom.

1.4 Foucault's Conception of Positive freedom

Historically liberals have espoused only conceptions of Negative freedom and they have refrained from giving any formulations of Positive freedom out of the fear that this will lead to the establishment of tyranny (Berlin 1969). Foucault is unique in the sense that although he shares the liberal aversion towards positive conceptions of freedom he in the manner of Kant tries to put forth a minimalist conception of Positive freedom. Foucault agrees with liberals that no one has the right to tell others how to behave and how to act in the moral sense nonetheless he believes that a certain minimalist conception of Positive freedom is

indispensable even for the practise of Negative freedom. Foucault in his conception of Positive freedom does not articulate a programme to be followed by others. He is simply delineating the logical conclusions and entailments of the 'belief' in freedom. There are three implications of this belief in freedom. We shall consider these below.

1.4(i) Positive Freedom as Construction of self

Foucault follows Kant's lead here. Kant had denied that moral law might be based on the 'will of God' or on natural law on the ground that this will infringe the autonomy of morality. This is another way of saying that morality is nothing but autonomy: "Kant is the first modern philosopher to make freedom a 'condition' of the very possibility of ethics or morality. He helped to introduce into ethics the task of free 'constructing' or 'making' ourselves in a free space governed by the necessity of nature, or based in a natural knowledge" (Rajchman 1991 p. 112). Kant's claim was that to be autonomous it was incumbent to treat moral law, as not given. On the contrary moral law should be constructed by autonomous individuals. The universal law of freedom is autonomous precisely in the sense that each individual makes it himself in his rational capacity. To treat moral law as 'given' is heteronomous for Kant precisely because it would not be 'made' by autonomous individuals themselves, "Among the radical novelties of Kant was the notion that we construct our ethical position. Kant said that we construct our ethical position. Kant said we do this by recourse to reason, but the innovation is not reason but construction. Kant argued that the only way moral law is moral is if we can make it. Foucault's historicism combined

with the notion of constructing morality leads one away form the latter and the law of Kant, but curiously preserving Kant's spirit" (Hoy ed. 1986 p. 239).

The moral self can not be taken as 'given' after we have rejected theology and natural law as the basis of morality. In this vein Foucault redefines ethics as self to self relation. Thus for autonomy one needs not the construction of law and then fashioning of self according to this law but the free construction of self.

"In European culture", as Foucault reads it "up to the sixteenth century, the problem remains; what is the work which I must effect upon my self so as to be capable and worthy of acceding to the truth" (FR p. 371). Not every subject is capable or worthy of knowledge. It is only a moral subject, which is worthy of knowing. For example, for the stoics, "(The) subject first (had to) ensure his autonomy and independence" in order that "he be able to recognise the order of the world as it stands" (ibid.). Descartes according to Foucault broke this tradition of giving priority to the ethical subject: "Descartes, I think, broke this when he said, 'To accede to truth, it suffices that I be **any** subject. Which can see what is evident" (ibid. emphasis in the original). Thus, "I can be immoral and know the truth. I believe that this is an idea which more or less explicitly, was rejected by all previous cultures" (p. 372).

Foucault claims Descartes broke the tradition of giving priority to the ethical subject and claims that Kant restored this priority[32]. Thus he claims that the significance of Kant consists in that he reestablishes the priority of ethics (freedom) over knowledge:

> "After Descartes, we have a subject of knowledge that poses for Kant the problem of knowing the relation between the subject of ethics and that of knowledge . . . Kant's solution was to find a universal subject which, to the extent (to which) it was universal, could be the subject of knowledge,

> but which demanded nonetheless, an ethical attitude-precisely the relation to the self which Kant proposes in the **Critique of Practical reason"** (FR p. 372).

So Foucault claims that "Kant introduces one more way in our tradition whereby the self is not merely given but is constituted in relation to itself as subject" (ibid.).

The movement from Descartes to Foucault consists of a fourfold mutation. Descartes has the concept of a 'given', theoretical subject. Ethics is under the sway of natural law and thus no distinction can be made between theoretical subject and the subject of ethics. With Kant we have a distinction between the theoretical subject and the ethical subject, since the latter has this unique ability "to bring into existence its own proper object, free decisions that conform to the requirement of reason alone" (Sullivan 1989 p. 104). The ethical subject in Kant is pure spontaneity and constructed by the rational agent according rational maxims based on his own rational self. Foucault takes the Kantian quest a step further. The theoretical and ethical subject is explicitly differentiated. The theoretical subject is given but only with reference to a specific episteme and hence it is not universal. Ethical subject is not 'given' and is constructed but not according to a universal law of freedom. According to Foucault freedom can not be bound to a universal law, since it negates Kant's own best insight: the insight that succumbing to 'giveness' tantamounts to heteronomy. Foucault agrees with Kant about the self construction of the self but this construction is to be effected not with reference to any universal law of freedom but by the free exercise of freedom itself.

Foucault clears this point by contrasting his position to that of Sartre: "I think from the theoretical point of view Sartre avoids the idea of self as something given to us, but through the notion of authenticity he turns back to the idea that we have to be ourselves-to be our true self" (FR p. 239).

One could construct a similar argument against Kant. Kant introduced in modern thought the idea of the self as not 'given', but he reintroduced it through his curious conception of the universal law of freedom. Foucault considers Kant's conception of the universal law of freedom contrary to the meaning of freedom. According to Foucault "the 'condition' of freedom does not stand in its 'deliberate forms' as general regularity to the cases it subsumes; it is not a regulative ideal one must instantiate or exemplify. It is rather the condition of the 'undefined work' that opens new possibilities for being, and that exposes the presumed 'necessity' of inherited ones" (Rajchman 1991 p. 112). Freedom in the negative sense is the ontological condition of freedom in the positive sense. But after that we have no fixed rules or any regulations as to how we should construct and practice this Positive freedom. There is no law, no ideal self to guide us how should we fashion ourselves positively.

This is the logical conclusion of the belief in freedom: "From the ideal that self is not given to us, I think that there is only one practical consequence: we have to create ourselves" (FR p. 351). Foucault reasserts the same vision with reference to Baudelaire: "Modern man, for Baudelaire, is not the man who goes off to discover himself, his secrets and his hidden truth, he is the man who tries to invent himself. This modernity does not 'liberate man in his own being', it compels him to face the task of producing himself" (ibid. p. 42).

1.4(ii) Positive Freedom as Aesthetics of Existence

The search for autonomy consists in transcending the forms of subjugation that constitute us and giving ourselves rules, styles and conventions that are of our own making. We can not refer to any predetermined rules simply because we have rejected all that is pregiven, as having any normative force. This self fashioning in search of autonomy without any

predetermined rules and pregiven is what Foucault calls the aesthetic of existence. This self fashioning without reference to any rules and predetermined patterns is what amounts to making our lives a work of art and giving **style** to one's existence. As Paul Veyne puts it:

> "The idea of style of existence played a major role in Foucault's conversations and doubtless in his inner life during the final months of his life that only he knew to be in danger. Style does not mean distinction here; the word is to be taken in the sense of the Greeks, for whom an artist was first of all an artisan and a work of art was first of all a work. Greek ethics is quite dead and Foucault judged it as undesirable as it would be impossible to resuscitate this ethics; but he considered one of its elements, namely the idea of work of self on self, to be capable of acquiring a contemporary meaning, in the manner of one of those pagan temple columns that are occasionally reutilised in more recent structures. We can guess at what might emerge from this diagnosis: the self, taking itself as a work to be accomplished, could sustain an ethics that is no longer supported by either tradition or reason; as an artist of itself, the self would enjoy that autonomy that Enlightenment can no longer do without" (Veyne 1997b p. 231).

It is just not that Greek ethics is dead and can not be revived. More than this, Foucault's real interest is not in reviving Greek ethics but to see how it can help to continue essentially a Kantian project; and he thinks that the Greek idea of ethics as a work of art and giving style to one's existence can help articulate an ethics which can not possibly be based on the knowledge of essences or on divine or natural law (due to Kant's insights) and has denied divine law, if the West does not believe anymore in natural law, if the West has discovered that practical reason or moral reason does not provide any preestablished norms and if the West still believes in the project of autonomy then what else can it do but to take the ethical enterprise as a work of art? What made the Greek idea of aesthetics of existence or of giving style to one's existence so fascinating for Foucault was the fact that it was not concerned with law (be it divine or natural) nor with the knowledge of what one is. Thus it makes

possible to actualise two main Kantian insights, of distancing ethics from knowledge and law. As he puts it commenting on the Greek idea of morality:

> "The point is obvious: be it in the form of a hierarchical structure of the human being, in the form of a practice of prudence or of the soul's recognition of its own being, the relation to truth constituted an essential element of moderation. It was necessary for the measured use of pleasures, necessary for controlling their violence. **But it is important to note that this relation to truth never took the form of a hermeneutics of desire. It was a factor constituting the mode of being of the moderate subject; it was not equivalent to an obligation for the subject to speak truthfully concerning himself; it never opened up the soul as a domain of potential knowledge where barley discernible traces of desire needed to be read and interpreted. The relation to truth was a structural, instrumental, and ontological condition for establishing the individual as a moderated subject leading a life of moderation; it was not an epistemological condition enabling the individual to recognise himself in his singularity as a desiring subject and to purify himself of the desire that was thus brought to light**" (Foucault 1985 pp. 88-89 emphasis added).

If Kant had argued that nature had no normative power and it is only human beings who give norms to their life, style and meaning and sense to it, it also meant that one should get rid of this hermeneutic of self and the Kantian notions of causality of freedom and categorical imperative.

It was Kant's confusion between the ontological conditions of freedom and the epistemological (normative) foundations of freedom that not only made him oblivious to the contingent historical limits imposed on autonomy, but also paved the way for confusing the epistemological subject and the ethical subject and hence reintroduced knowledge into the realm of ethics.

The search for knowledge and truth indeed remained essential for Foucault but as an instrumental condition for freedom, and not as hermeneutic of the self because that would

reintroduce the naturalism Kant had so heroically purged form the ethical realm. The rigorous consideration of Kantian insights leads to the conclusion that the exercise of Positive freedom and autonomy cannot rely on pregiven rules and laws nor on truth about external or internal nature but it can only take the form of a free relation of the self to it self. And this fashioning of the self would have no appeal for others except an aesthetic appeal.

In other words it would serve as a model or example devoid of any authoritative (normative) force for others or for ourselves. As Foucault writes, "in antiquity the will to be a moral subject . . . was principally an effort to affirm one's freedom and to give one's life a certain form in which one could recognise oneself, be recognised by others, and in which posterity would find an example" (Foucault 1989a p. 311). But "there was never a question of making it (Greek morality) an **obligation** for all. **Morality was a matter of individual choice;** any one could come and share in it" (PPC p. 245 emphasis added).

And he also sees philosophy as an example of this search for giving style to one's life, an **exercise** in thought, and hence in autonomous fashioning of one's self:

> "What is philosophy today _ philosophical activity, I mean _ if it is not the critical work that thought brings to bear on itself? In what does it consist, if not in the endeavour to know how and to what extent it might be possible to think differently, instead of legitimating what is already known? There is always something ludicrous in philosophical discourse when it tries, from the outside, to dictate others, to tell them where their truth is and how to find it, or when it works up a case against them in the language of naïve positivity. But it is entitled to explore what might be changed, in its own thought through the practice of knowledge that is foreign to it. The 'essay' _ which should be understood as the assay or test by which, in the game of truth one undergoes changes, and not as the simplistic appropriation of others for the purpose of communication _ is the living substance of philosophy, at least if we assume that philosophy is still it was in times past, i.e; an 'ascesis,' **askesis,** an exercise of oneself in the activity of thought" (Foucault 1985 pp. 8-9).

The exercise of autonomy in the wake of Kant becomes the work of self on self through the activity of thought and not obeying some fixed rule _ the activity of thought which is inherently an activity without rules and hence necessarily a perilous exercise.

Modernist thought initiated by Kant denies solutions imposed from above in the name of God, or nature. And if morality is refusal to obey God, law and the truth of nature, then for modernist thought there can be no morality in the traditional sense. From Kant it had learnt the lesson that to obey others is heteronomy and if morality in the wake of Kant has become synonymous to autonomy, then it is an undeniable conclusion that:

> "Modern thought has never . . . been able to propose a morality. But the reason for this is not because it is pure speculation; on the contrary, modern thought, from its very density, is certain mode of action. Let those who urge thought to leave its retreat and to formulate its choices talk on; and let those who seek, without any pledge and in the absence of virtue, to establish a morality do as they wish. For modern thought, no morality is possible. Thought had already 'left' itself in its own being . . . it is no longer theoretical. As soon as it functions it offends or reconciles, attracts or repels, breaks, dissociates, unites or reunites; it cannot help but liberate and enslave. Even before prescribing, suggesting a future, saying what must be done, even before exhorting or merely sounding alarm, thought, at the level of its existence, in its very dawning, is in itself an action _ a perilous action" (Foucault 1970 p. 328).

1.4(iii) Positive Freedom as Practice

Freedom for Foucault is not a thing, it is a practice. As practice it can not be 'represented', can not be possessed, can not be distributed and can not be guaranteed through institutional and constitutional guarantees. It must be exercised:

> "Freedom is practice; . . . the freedom of men is never assured by the laws and the institutions that are intended to guarantee them. That is why almost all of these laws and institutions are quite capable of being turned around. Not because they are ambiguous, but simply because 'freedom' is what must be

> exercised . . . I think it can never be inherent in the structure of things to (itself) guarantee the exercise of freedom. The guarantee of freedom is freedom" (FR p. 245).

Freedom as practice is what is ethics for Foucault. "Freedom", Foucault tells us, "is the ontological condition of ethics; but ethics is the deliberate form assumed by freedom" (Foucault 1987 p. 115).

Foucault is not saying that Negative freedom is useless or that negative rights enshrined in constitutions are a façade or that institutions erected for safeguarding rights and freedoms are useless. He is only saying that all this must be followed by actual exercise of freedom, practice of freedom individual or collective. Foucault makes this point clear:

> "I do not mean to say that liberation or such and such a form of liberation does not exist. When a colonial people tries to free itself of its coloniser, that is truly an act of liberation, in the strict sense of the word. But we also know that . . . this act of liberation is not sufficient to establish the practice of liberty that later on will be necessary for this people, this society and this individual to decide upon receivable and acceptable forms of their existence or political society" (quoted in Bell 1996 p. 86).

Foucault's vision of a society of freedom is a society committed to permanent practice of freedom at the individual and collective level not in order to erect eventually a utopia where all relations would become transparent but because freedom is what 'must be exercised'.

Two things must be noted about this practice of freedom. First, it is both negative and positive practice. In negative terms it is aimed at the present, existing regime of relations while in positive terms it aims at a reconstitution of the relational regime on a new basis. Negative freedom has no meaning unless it is supplemented by Positive freedom. Without this Negative freedom remains trapped in already existing relational regime.

Second the reconstitution must be on all three levels of the relational regime i.e. self to self, self to other and self to object. This is because as we have already seen Foucault sees these three types of relational regimes as implicated in each other and alteration in the mode of one relation is impossible without alteration in the mode of other relations. True, Foucault has emphasised the strategic position occupied by the self to self relation in modern relational regimes but this should not be construed as meaning that reconstitution of self to self relation is possible in isolation from other relations.

What Foucault meant by the strategic position occupied by the self in modern relational regimes is the fact that for their workings the other relations (need to) have recourse to technologies of self. Thus in such a system domination over others requires first of all a self domination etc. Thus it is wrong to present this as proof of the assertion that Foucault in the last of his writings moved away from the social outlook of his earlier writings to preoccupation with the self. A close reading of the last two volumes of the **History of Sexuality** shows clearly that this is not the case. Thus the reconstitution of self relation proposed in for example (Foucault 1985) is not possible without establishing a new relation with truth (ibid. pp. 88-89).

1.5 Conclusion:

To conclude this chapter we can say that Foucault is clearly situated in that tradition of European thought, which spearheaded the revolt against Christianity. He is committed to the fundamental value around which this revolt was organised and from which it takes its meaning and inspiration, i.e. freedom. Foucault's critique of different notions emanate from this fundamental commitment to freedom. Freedom provides the reference point for Foucauldian analysis and Foucauldian straggles. Thus Foucault is simply wrong to claim that

his analysis and struggles do not refer to any universal. They do refer to a universal and freedom is that universal.

II

Foucault's Analysis Of Modern Capitalism

The bourgeoisie (was) perfectly well aware that a new constitution or legislature will not suffice to assure its hegemony; it relise(d) that it has to invent a new technology ensuring the effects of the power of the whole social body down to its smallest particles. And it was by such means that the bourgeoisie not only made a revolution but succeeded in establishing a social hegemony which it has never relinquished. This is why . . . inventions (like panopticon) were so important, and why no doubt Bentham is one of the most exemplary inventors of technologies of power.

Foucault The Eye of Power[1]

2.1 Foucault and Capitalism: An Introduction

A specific understanding of the place and role of capitalism permeates the analyses carried out by Foucault. This is natural for two reasons. First Foucault as a 'historian of the present' (DP p. 31) could hardly have ignored the motor of modern societies i.e. capitalism. Second Foucault always situated himself in what may be broadly termed as the 'leftist' camp. He regularly defines his work as an endeavour to come up with a 'new' left thinking which is

not encumbered by traditional Marxism or what Foucault alternatively terms as 'communistology': (t)he 'game' whose rules are defined not by Marx but "by communist parties who decide how you must use Marx so as to be declared by them to be a Marxist" (PK p. 53). Foucault's work is replete with terms such as 'bourgeoisie', 'bourgeois morality'; etc, these terms are almost without exception used in derogatory way and which manifest Foucault's great contempt for everything bourgeois.

Madness and Civilisation (**MC**) is perhaps the first book where we can see Foucault's concern with capitalism in a relatively explicitly. In what follows I shall use Foucault's account of capitalism in **MC** as a specimen of his analysis of capitalism up till **Discipline and Punish** (**DP**). In **MC** Foucault speaks of the significance of the ethical and moral meaning of labour and work for the development of early capitalism; what he aptly terms as the 'ethical consciousness of labour'. In this "first phase of industrial world" Foucault writes "labour did not seem limited to the problem it was to provoke; it was regarded, on the contrary, as a general solution, an infallible panacea, a remedy to all forms of poverty; labour and poverty were located in a simple opposition, in inverse proportion to each other. As for that power, its special characteristic of abolishing poverty, labour . . . possessed it not so much by its productive capacity as by a certain force of moral enchantment. Labour's effectiveness was acknowledged because it was based on an ethical transcendence" (MC p. 55). Foucault speaks of the concept of idleness in the early industrial capitalism in similar ethical terms: "Pride was the sin of man before the Fall but the sin of Idleness is the supreme pride of man once he has fallen, the absurd pride of poverty. In our world, where the land is no longer fertile except in thistles and weeds, idleness is the fault **par excellence**"(ibid. p. 56 emphasis retained). Though Foucault recognises the 'rules' of forced labour in early

capitalism he refuses to accept the solely economic interpretation of confinement. It had above all an ethical significance and 'ethical meaning': "Labour in the house of confinement thus assumed its ethical meaning; since sloth had become the absolute form of rebellion, the idle would be forced to work, in the endless leisure of a labour without 'utility' or profit". (ibid. p. 57). Thus 'Hopital' the main confinement centre of Paris in the seventeenth century "does not have the appearance of a mere refuge for those whom age infirmity, or sickness keep from working; it will have not only the aspect of a forced labour camp but also that of a moral institution responsible for punishing, for correcting a certain moral "abeyance" which does not merit the tribunal of men, but cannot be corrected by the severity of penance alone. The Hopital General has an ethical status" (ibid. p. 59). Thus a distance from economism can be glimpsed from Foucault's account in these early chapters of **MC**^{2}**.**

Transition from the discussion of poor idle and their place in the conceptions, ethics and institutions of early capitalism to that of madness is quite smooth and logical. Foucault defines the place of madness in early capitalism in quite similar terms. Madness is defined in the general framework of 'bourgeois order' and its 'rationality'. What distinguish 'madman' from the 'normal man' was "their inability to work and to follow the rhythms of collective life" (ibid. p. 58). Madness is defined in terms of the same deviation from the same ethical consciousness that defined the existence of the idle poor. Quite naturally madmen found their place beside the poor idles. Hence arose the need to 'confine' madman alongside poor and idle in order to 'correct' that which had corrupted their heart:

> " . . . madness was perceived through a condemnation of idleness and in a social immanence guaranteed by the community of labour. This community acquired an ethical power of segregation,

> which permitted it to eject, as into another world, all forms of social uselessness. It was in this **other world,** encircled by the sacred powers of labour, that madness would assume the status we now attribute to it. If there is, in classical madness, something which refers elsewhere, and to **other things,** it is no longer because the madman comes from the world of the irrational and bears its stigma; rather, it is because he crosses the frontiers of bourgeois order of his own accord, and alienates himself outside the sacred limits of its ethics". (ibid. p. 58).

Foucault clearly perceives here capitalism as a moral order and capitalist rationality emanates from this 'moral order'. Hence Foucault does not see capitalist rationality as a value neutral mechanism for efficient accumulation of means needed for pursuing **any** end (standard liberal justification of capitalist order)[3] but a normative rationality that is not just defined as a mechanism of efficient means but necessarily leads to and presupposes commitment to a certain very specific type of life styles. Although it is true that capitalism has the capability of incorporating diversity into the ways of life it sanctions, unmatched by any traditional way of life, this incorporation is only possible through the acceptance of fundamental capitalist morality and rationality as the **indispensable** condition of existence, sustenance and survival in the modern world. According to this reading, capitalism is not just an economic system but a world view, a civilisation and the hegemony of capitalism in a narrow sense as a system of accumulation depends upon the hegemony of capitalist moral order and capitalist rationality in the normative sense.

Transition in Foucault's analysis in **MC** from confinement to the asylum is not effected by any change in the conception or functioning of capitalism. Only the ways and means of 'correction' become subtler. While the regime in confinement was based on 'imposition' of authority from above in the asylum we have internalisation of authority and capitalist

morality. This does not mean however that the regime in the asylum was less authoritarian as it is normally assumed: "the asylum no longer punished the madman's guilt, it is true; but it did more, it organised the guilt; organised it for madman as a consciousness of himself, and as a non reciprocal relationship to the keeper, it organised it for the man of reason as an awareness of the other, a therapeutic intervention in the madman's existence . . . from the awareness of his guilt, the madman was to return to his awareness of himself as a free and responsible subject, and consequently to reason . . . (by) objectifying himself for the other, the madman thus returned to his liberty . . . ." (MC p. 247). All elements of Foucault's later analysis of capitalism can be found in a nutshell in the above analysis. For all practical purposes **MC** contains almost everything Foucault had to say about capitalism in an implicit form.

It is appropriate to define the terms used above to proceed further. **Capitalist morality** may be defined as a conception, which considers accumulation for the sake of accumulation not only a factual necessity but also something desirable for its own sake. Everything leading to accumulation is then considered as good while everything hindering it is considered bad. Acceptance of **capitalist morality**, as we shall see in detail, is what makes capitalist self discipline possible. Similarly we define capitalist rationality as a conception which considers capital accumulation and everything leading to it as rational while everything hindering it as **irrational**. By capitalist **moral order** we mean the order, which sustains the conception of capitalist morality and capitalist rationality as the only legitimate conception of morality and rationality.

Let me summarise here the "crux" of Foucault's conception of capitalism in **MC**:

- Capitalism is not merely an economic system but above all a 'moral order'/worldview.

- Capitalist rationality emanates from and presupposes this 'moral order'. Hence capitalist rationality is not a value neutral mechanism of accumulation, which is indispensable for pursuing **any** end and is compatible with the pursuit of **any** end but a normative rationality, which is compatible with only those ends, which can be incorporated within or adjusted to the capitalist 'moral order'.

- Thus the working of capitalism as a system of accumulation depends on the constant reproduction of capitalist 'moral order'.

Foucault's analysis upto **DP** is profuse with implicit and explicit references and presuppositions about capitalism, as we saw above in our review of **MC** from this angle. However nowhere before **DP** does Foucault try to relate in **explicit** terms **how** his analysis from **MC** to **DP** is related to the problematic of capitalism in its specificity and concreteness. Foucault gives answer to this question in **DP** and **History of Sexuality Vol. 1** (**HS**) and in subsequent interviews and lectures.

As we have seen we can separate in Foucault's usage the two senses of capitalism: capitalism as an economic system that promotes accumulation and capitalism as a 'moral order' with the former being subservient to the latter. The reproduction of capitalist 'moral order' is termed by Foucault in his later writings as accumulation of men. Capitalism as a system of the accumulation of men is analysed by Foucault in terms of the regime of

subjectivisation, the regime of truth and the power regime (regime of capitalist governmental rationality).

Now as far as capitalism as an economic system is concerned it is certainly not the object of Foucault's analysis. Foucault's analysis is primarily concerned with capitalism as accumulation of men since the analysis of power, truth and the subjectivisation regime is key to Foucault's entire oeuvre. However, Foucault is not interested in the analysis of the system of accumulation of men **per se,** he is interested in accumulation of men in its **relation** to the accumulation of capital. Thus Foucault's analysis is mainly concerned with the **relation** of capital accumulation to the system of accumulation of men.

Foucault studies the relationship between the accumulation of men and the accumulation of capital with the view of arriving at the conditions of the possibility and continued sustenance of capitalism. It is normally understood that Foucault studies the strategies of the accumulation of men as the function of the problem of governance but what is seldom understood is that the problem of governance is treated by Foucault not in isolation but in relationship to the problem of the accumulation of capital. Thus the problem is not just of governance but of the **type of governance** that provides the space in which hindrances to capital accumulation are the least while the possibilities are being utilised to the maximum. Thus the problem is not just to produce ''docile'' bodies but the type of ''docile'' bodies, which are 'useful' too; ''docility'' is to maximise ''utility''. The type of ''docility'' that hampers ''utility'' is unacceptable. Thus the problem of governance in Foucault is the problem of the governance for capital accumulation. Foucault defines the purpose of 'disciplines', which are "the 'techniques' for assuring the ordering of multiplicities" and

enhancing governance, as "to increase both the 'docility' and the 'utility' of all the elements of the system" (DP p. 218). Thus Foucault deals with the problem of accumulation of men and its relationship to the accumulation of capital so as to arrive at the conditions of the possibility and continued sustenance of capital accumulation.

That capitalism provides not only the indispensable context but the main object of Foucault's analysis of the regime of the accumulation of men is clear from our brief discussion above. Foucault in general terms make it clear that:

> "The two processes – the accumulation of men and the accumulation of capital – cannot be separated; it would not have been possible to solve the problem of the accumulation of men without the growth of an apparatus of production capable of both sustaining them and using them; conversely, the techniques that made the cumulative multiplicity of men useful accelerated the accumulation of capital . . . Each makes the other possible and necessary; each provides a model for the other" (DP p. 221).

> ". . . the economic system that promotes the accumulation of capital and the system of power that ordains the accumulation of men are, from the seventeenth century on, correlated and unseparable phenomena . . . ." (FR p. 67).

But the problem is not just of showing how the system of producing 'docility' is correlated to the system of 'utility' maximisation and how the techniques used in one system could be projected unto and used in the other. The level of Foucault's analysis is deeper and subtler than this. What Foucault investigates beyond the above correlation is **how prior to this correlation and as the condition of the possibility of this correlation** there existed more fundamental relationship between the system of accumulation of men and the system of

accumulation of capital. At this fundamental level the crux of Foucault's analysis is that the system of the production of ''docility'', the system of governance that is, is already implicated in the system of the accumulation of capital as its condition in the sense that the methods and **techniques** that enhance the ''docility'' are the very same methods and techniques that maximise ''utility''. The methods of governance are **already** the methods of maximising the accumulation of capital. It is not the case that there is one system for the production of 'docility', of governance and there is another system of production of ''utility'', of capital, which are then correlated and reinforce each other. Prior to this and as the condition of the possibility of this correlation and reinforcement there exists, so to say, a **primordial** order which is at **once** the way of governance and the maximisation of accumulation of capital: 'polity' in capitalist order is already the capitalist polity, it is not just an instrument in the hand of capitalists. No wonder Foucault defines disciplines as "the **unitary** technique by which the body is reduced as a 'political' force at the least cost and maximised as a useful force" (ibid. emphasis added). Thus the capitalist 'government' and capitalist system of productivity and exchange are two sides of the same coin. As Foucault puts it:

> ". . . bio-power was without question an indispensable element in the development of capitalism; the latter would not have been possible without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic processes. But **this was not all it required; it also needed the growth of both these factors, their reinforcement as well as their availability and 'docility'; it had to have methods of power capable of optimising forces, aptitudes, and life in general without at the same time making them more difficult to govern.** If the development of the great instruments of the state, as **institutions** of power, ensured the maintenance of production relations, the rudiments of anatomo-and bio-politics, created in the eighteenth century as **techniques** of power present at every level of the social body and utilised by

> very diverse institutions (the family and the army, schools and the police, individual medicine and the administration of collective bodies), operated in the sphere of economic processes, their development, and the forces working to sustain them. They also acted as factors of segregation and social hierarchization, exerting their influence on the respective forces of both these movements, guaranteeing relationships of domination and effects of hegemony. The adjustment of the accumulation of men to that of capital, the joining of the growth of human groups to the expansion of productive forces and the differential allocation of profit, were made possible in part by the exercise of bio-power in its many forms and modes of application. The investment of the body, its valorization, and the distributive management of its forces were at the time indispensable (HS pp. 140-141 emphasis added).

This is Foucault's fundamental insight which has been obscured by the fact that Foucault does not **specify** this fundamental relation between the system of the production of ''docility'' and 'utility' in any great detail. Thus Foucault never tries to **specify** in any great detail **how** his analysis of the accumulation of men is related to the system of accumulation of capital and **how** this mutual relation constitutes the regime of the conditions of the possibility of capitalism in general[4].

In the following I shall take the three major elements of Foucault's analysis of the problem of governance and accumulation of man i.e. the regime of subjectivisation, the regime of truth and the regime of governmental rationality (regime of power) and try to **specify** in detail the relationship between these three elements of the regime of accumulation of men and governance and their relationship to the system of accumulation of capital.

2.2 The Conditions of the Possibility of Capitalism

Capitalism as a system of the accumulation of capital depends upon the **conditions** which are indispensable for the production and reproduction of individuals **and** populations that are **simultaneously** 'docile' and useful; **simultaneously** governable and productive. We will study each of the three conditions with the aim to see how they are simultaneously geared to the production and reproduction of governable and productive individuals and populations[5].

2.2 (i) Capitalist Subjectivisation Regime

"Subjectivity" is defined by Foucault as a form of "organisation of self consciousness" (PPC p. 253) implying that there may be forms of 'organisation' of self consciousness other than subjectivity/subject. I define manageable subjectivity as a subjectivity which has two characteristics; it has some degree of freedom/diversity and second this diversity is amenable to organisation under a singularity. We cannot talk of a manageable subjectivity without the presence of these two elements. Management techniques are not operationalisable on individuals who are not allowed freedom. One cannot talk of managing slaves in this sense. In this context Foucault asserts that "power (read management!) is exercised over free subjects, and **only insofar as they are free"** (SP p. 221 emphasis provided). Second this freedom/diversity should be such that it can be traced back to a singularity. Diversity that cannot be traced back to singularity leads to "dangerous subjectivity" (PPC pp. 125-151), a subjectivity that is not manageable.

Thus for the production and reproduction of manageable subjectivity one requires diversity but the limit of this diversity would be the ultimate ability to retract this diversity and lock it into singularity. If diversity exceeds this **limit** subjectivity no longer remains manageable. It enters the threshold of ‘‘dangerous’’ subjectivity. The apparent paradox of capitalism is that in order to increase the ‘utility’ and productive capacity of individuals and populations it requires to keep expanding the ambit of freedom and diversity but in order to make individuals ‘‘docile’’ and hence governable, it needs to limit this diversity by setting limits so that it remains manageable. **It is on the maintenance of this delicate balance between diversity and singularity that the sustenance and continuity of the whole capitalist system rests.** Curbing freedom and diversity would decrease ‘‘utility’’ and productivity and hence slow the motor of production and innovation on whose ever increasing speed the legitimacy of the whole system depends. On the other hand expansion in the ambit of freedom and diversity to the extent that it becomes non retractable to singularity would delink diversity from the singularity of capital accumulation. It would become ungovernable (hence creating a crisis of governance) in the sense that it would no longer be a capitalist governance i.e. governance for the sake of capital accumulation.

Thus curbing freedom is not what capitalism requires. The continued existence of capitalism requires continued expansion of the sphere of freedom. However capitalism requires that this expansion be geared towards a single end i.e. capital accumulation. The problem of capitalism is not freedom but intransigence of freedom, the possibility that freedom may take forms that are not retractable to the singularity of capital accumulation. Thus the problem of

capitalism is neither servitude nor freedom **per se**, the problem of capitalism is the problem of the intransigence of freedom:

> "The relationship between power and freedom's refusal to submit cannot . . . be separated. The crucial problem of power is not that of voluntary servitude . . . . At the every heart of the power relationship, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom. Rather than speaking of an essential freedom, it would be better to speak of an 'agonism' – of a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face – to face confrontation which paralyses both sides than a permanent provocation" (SP. pp. 221-222).

In fact, as we shall see in detail, [see section 2.2 (iv)] freedom is central for the functioning of a capitalist system not only as the precondition for enhancing 'utility' and diversity but for its double role as the precondition of enhancing diversity and imposing singularity on multiplicity:

> ". . . there is no face to face confrontation of power and freedom which is mutually exclusive (freedom disappears every where power is exercised), but a much more complicated interplay. In this game freedom may well appear as the condition for the exercise of power (at the same time its precondition, since freedom must exist for power to be exerted, and also its permanent support, since without the possibility of recalcitrance, power would be equivalent to a physical determination) [ibid. p. 221].

Historically 'freedom' has played this role of imposing singularity over multiplicity through the process of subjectivisation, through the creation of a subjectivity/subject. Two key concepts, which have been operationalised to create and justify[6] capitalist subjectivity, have been very important, viz: the notion of identity (in the natural law tradition) and morality (in the Kantian tradition).

The notion of identity provides the focal point to which all diversity and multiplicity refers back. In the natural law tradition freedom is defined as being one's true/authentic self. The formation of capitalist subjectivity is closely related to the notion of identity to the extent that Foucault defines the meaning of the term 'subject' in terms of the notion of identity: "There are two meanings of the word **subject:** subject to some one else by control and dependence, and **tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge**. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and make subject to (ibid. p. 212 emphasis added). This form of power is the power of management which manages individuals and population by tying their activities to their identity, by referring back all diversity to the identity and hence imposing singularity over multiplicity: "This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorises the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognise in him" (ibid.). This double game that freedom plays in the system can be understood as conceiving freedom as a centre from which rays emanate towards every direction but only to converge back to the centre. Identity provides the basis of this convergence back.

In the Kantian tradition morality plays the same role. Through Kant's conception of morality as self-determination room is provided for diversity but through the conception of the categorical imperative singularity is reimposed on this diversity. Self-determination is moral only to the extent that it can ultimately converge back to this singularity. Foucault considered the "form of a morality acceptable to everyone . . . as catastrophic" precisely because it is the imposition of a singularity over diversity. Similarly Foucault praised Greek morality because

it lacked conception of the imposition of singularity over diverse moral experiences, in diverse domains concerning diverse strata of population. There was no single morality for all. Thus Foucault praises Greek morality for having “several forms of freedom” (PPC p. 245). In Greek morality there was “no one single domain that would unify all moral domains”(ibid. p. 261). Christianity effected this change by introducing the notion of morality as singularity: “(a)mong the great transformations that Christianity was to bring about was the notion that the ethics of flesh was suited for woman as for men. In the ancient morality, on the other hand self control is a problem only for the individual who must be master of himself and master of others and not for those who must obey others. That is why this ethics concerns only men and does not have exactly the same form when applied to relations with one’s own body, with one’s wife, or with boys” (ibid. pp. 261-262). Modern capitalism derived its conception of morality from Christianity and applied it (with modification of course) to manage the ever-growing diversity that is the hallmark of these societies.

Thus the production and reproduction of a manageable subjectivity is necessary for capitalism. Capital accumulation requires the corresponding accumulation of manageable subjectivity.

In the above section we have established the point that the notions of 'morality' and 'identity' are means of imposing singularity over diversity. We have yet to establish (although we have already pointed to it) that this singularity is singularity of capital accumulation. We do this in the next section.

2.2(ii) Capitalist Truth Regime

Foucault's overall conception of truth is fairly Nietzschean. The notion of universal truth is a 'dangerous' chimera as it is a tool to impose a singularity in the name of objectivity. It is a chimera because human finitude leaves no room for the transcendence of the sort that carries itself with the notion of objectivity. Truth for Foucault on the other hand is 'produced' within discourse and it is meaningless to speak of truth outside discourse: " . . . the problem does not consist in drawing a line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientificity or truth, and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing how historically effects of truth are produced within discourses **which in themselves are neither true nor false**" (FR p. 60 emphasis added). Thus truth is always an embodied and emended truth. It is embedded in the overall discursive structures and is produced and reproduced through this very embededdness. As Foucault puts it:

> ". . . truth isn't the reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude; nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth; that is, the types of discourses which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enables one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (FR pp. 72-73).

The 'general politics' of truth establishes what would be counted as truth and what as untruth in a society. This 'general politics' of truth imposes singularity over the multiple of truths accepted in any society. But what distinguishes the 'general politics' of truth in capitalist

societies from other societies is its unique blend of diversity and singularity, 'docility' and 'utility'. The same double bind operates here which we saw operating in the subjectivisation regime. On the one hand the requirements of productivity and 'utility' entail and demand increasing profusion and diversity of the multiple forms of truths but the requirements of capitalist governance demand that this multiplicity must be retractable to the singularity of capital accumulation. All this diversity and multiplicity must converge back to the single truth which defines all the truths. This single truth is expressed in the rationality of capital accumulation for its own sake and the accumulation of men sustaining never ending capital accumulation.

In capitalist societies, according to Foucault "the 'political economy' of truth is characterised by five important traits":

> "Truth" is centred on the form of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it; it is subject to constant economic and political incitement (the demand for truth, as much for economic production as for political power); it is the object, under diverse forms, of immense diffusion and consumption (circulating through apparatuses of education and information whose extent is relatively broad in the social body, notwithstanding certain strict limitations); it is produced and transmitted under the control, dominant if not exclusive, of a few great political and economic apparatuses (university, army, writing, media); lastly, it is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation ("ideological" struggles) [ibid. p. 73].

Foucault adds three further 'propositions' (which he asks to be treated as hypotheses) to the above mentioned five characteristics of the truth regime in capitalist order:

> " 'Truth' is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements. 'Truth' is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extends it. A "regime" of truth.
>
> This regime is not merely ideological or superstructural; it was a condition of the formation and development of capitalism"(FR p. 74).

From these characterisations of the capitalist truth regime we can glean the following propositions which can help us ground our initial formulations.

- Capitalist truth regime identifies and justifies itself as objectivity/scientificity. This objectivity has two immediate functions: (a) it procures normative status for this truth regime. Truth claims become claims not only about what 'is' but about what should be. (b) it conceals and constantly camouflages the context of this truth regime. Objectivity camouflages the context of truth regime by conceptualising it as standing outside power relations. These two factors explain the 'central' role of the institution of the 'university' in capitalist order. It also explains the centrality of 'experts' in modern society in the form of bureaucracies and technocracies, which are the essential elements in the functioning of modern capitalism. These bureaucracies and technocracies are spearheaded and (mostly) constituted by the university professors[7].

- Although truth is produced within a context, within a regime this regime also requires this 'truth' to produce and reproduce and sustain itself. The mechanism for this is twofold (a) constant production, multiplication, diffusion and diversification of truth. This multiplicity should constantly increase, as it is essential to enhance innovation within the system. This innovation is the basis of 'utility' maximisation. Truth diversity and

diffusion is effected through continuous multiplication, ramification (for example of) of the university into faculties, faculties into departments, ever increasing specialisation etc. The same process applies to other capitalist institutions viz: electronic media, print media etc. This immense process of diffusion, diversification and multiplication is geared to the sustenance of the engines of capitalist innovation and production (b) All multiplicity, diversity must converge back towards a singularity however. The practical aspect of this is the necessity of all diverse and multiple truths to pass through the filter of great capitalist institutions viz; academic journals, expert comments and opinions, learned conferences and above all the institution of the university which is the converging ground of all other institutions, in order to gain objectivity, authenticity, acceptability and hence publicity. The 'knowledges' that fail to pass this test are dubbed unscientific, nonobjective, dubious and consequently marginalised and effectively silenced through not allowing them media 'outlets' which are under the hegemonic control of the capitalist regime of truth. Through the sole criterion of ability to be streamlined towards the singularity of capital accumulation, warranted truth is separated from the unwarranted truth (cf. PK pp. 78-92).

- This regime of truth is the condition of the "formation" and development of capitalism precisely in the sense that through this regime only that "truth" is produced and reproduced and only that truth is validated that is conducive to capital accumulation and for the production and reproduction of the **ethos,** society and system that is necessary for the sustenance of the system of capital accumulation.

Thus this capitalist truth regime defines as 'truth' all that leads to the singularity of capital accumulation and as 'untruth' whatever is thought to have even the potential of leading away

from this aim. This is because truth is produced by and within 'truth regime', "whose validity is . . . dependent on the approval of the established regimes of thought" (PK p. 81). If truth is produced within a regime, in the context of 'a system of power' which does not only produces but also sustains it, the 'nature' of power is necessarily going to be reflected in truth being produced. And if the 'nature' of power is such that it governs through maximising utility, the truth produced by and in the context of this power and its system is going to reflect this utility/docility fixture. It is in this context that university is a central capitalist institution and truth produced within it is inherently a capitalist truth. The university as a central capitalist institution for the production of truth only sanctions those truths that are necessary or useful for enhancing utility and making capitalist governance possible and purges and hinders and stigmatise truth and knowledges that are hindrance or may be pose threat to utility/docility complex (PK p. 82). Needless to repeat that the relationship between capitalist power and capitalist truth regimes is primordial since both are based on the same utility/docility principle and in the sense that reciprocal conditioning conditioned relationship exists between the two.

Since the capitalist system requires that ‘‘docility’’ be produced in such a manner, as not to hamper productivity, it is necessary that capitalist singularity should not be (mainly) imposed from above but should emanate from within. The capitalist truth regime plays an important role in this regard. The ‘objective’ truth is constantly produced, reproduced and circulated about the ‘individual’ his body and soul so as to standardise/normalise his ways of acting and being (in the context of the diversities that are allowed) that are compatible and conducive to the singularity of capital accumulation and these ways of acting and behaving and being (subjectivity) are dubbed as ‘natural’ and rational. Capitalist truth regime ensures that only

those ways of acting, behaving and being are considered normal and hence rational that can be subsumed under the singularity of capital accumulation. All other subjectivities are labelled/stigmatised as unnatural abnormal, delinquent and hence irrational and rigorously excluded and marginalised. The particular function that capitalist truth regime plays in this regard is two fold. First it standardises the behaviour, which is considered normal. Second it invents/evolves procedures/techniques to gain access to the body and soul of an individual to render him manageable.

Standardisation/normalisation procedures have been (curiously enough) evolved around the concept of "delinquency". Delinquency is a peculiar kind of deviation, a deviation that is linked to the very being of the deviant: "The delinquent is . . . to be distinguished from the offender in that he is not only the author of his acts (the author responsible in terms of certain criteria of free, conscious will), but is linked to his offence by a whole bundle of complex threads (instincts, derives, tendencies, character). The penitentiary technique bears not on the relation between author and crime, but on the criminal's affinity with his crime" (DP pp. 252-253). Far from repressing these delinquencies and anomalies, the system of normalisation evolved from the 'controlled' production of anomalies. There are at least three immediate functions of this 'controlled' production of anomalies: a) To depict the contours of 'normal' behaviour through specification of abnormalities b) Detailed techniques of observation, analyses to be developed to have 'access' to the body and soul of the individual c) Use this 'access' to 're-educate', 'correct' the individual and hence to produce desired subjectivity. The centrality of the institution of prison for capitalism and its development consists in the fact that it provided an early arena for this 'controlled' experimentation and

hence the focal point for defining the terms of the relation between 'punishment in general' and normalisation in modern capitalist societies.

To understand this further one would have to grasp that the central purpose of the prison is "the maintenance of delinquency, the encouragement of recidivism, the transformation of the occasional offenders into a habitual delinquent, the organisation of a **closed (read controlled!) milieu of delinquency** (ibid. p. 272 emphasis added). Prison was the laboratory for the controlled experimentation of the production and reproduction of delinquency, development of the techniques to have access to the whole being of the delinquent and the process of 're-educating' and 'correcting' delinquent and hence of producing the desired subjectivity[8]. Considering this:

> " . . . one would be forced to suppose that the prison, and no doubt punishment in general, is not intended to eliminate offences, but rather to distinguish them, to distribute them, to use them; that it is not so much that they render 'docile' those who are liable to transgress the law, **but that they tend to assimilate the transgression of the laws in a general tactics of subjection.** Penalty would then appear to be a way of handling illegalities, of laying down the limits of tolerance, of giving free rein to some, of putting pressure on others, of excluding a particular section, of making another useful, of neutralising certain individuals and of profiting from others. In short, penalty does not simply 'check' illegalities; it 'differentiates' them, it provides them with a general 'economy'. (ibid. p. 272 emphasis added).

In order to understand the mechanism of relating 'punishment in general' to the techniques of normalisation in its concreteness and specificity I would revert to a brief discussion of the three immediate functions of the 'controlled' production and reproduction of anomalies in the prison.

a) Why is normality to be depicted through anomaly, and not in its positivity? For two reasons. First what haunted capitalism from the outset was a subjectivity that is not manageable. Capitalism does not mind delinquencies and deviations as such. On the contrary it has found it useful to create them. What it dreads is unmanageable deviations. This is manifested in the notion of the ‘‘dangerous’’ individual, which may be understood as the spectre of unmanageable subjectivity. The notion of the ‘‘dangerous’’ individual is produced within the capitalist truth regime, and it is produced in view of its ‘utility’, its function which is to make “it possible to draw up a network of causality in terms of an entire biography (of the criminal) and to present a verdict of punishment – correction” (ibid. p. 252). This in turn would help to build a whole body of knowledge, which would contain the ‘truth’ about ‘‘dangerous’’ subjectivity and analysis, which would help to ‘manage’ such individuals. No wonder the core science in this respect, i.e. psychology/psychiatry is the science of anomalies.

Second, the dual requirement of ‘utility’ and ‘docility’ demands that the problem of normalising individuals be dealt with circumspection. Diversity is on the one hand geared towards singularity but on the other hand diversity which does not converge to this singularity is also tolerated on the condition that it does not threaten singularity, that it is not ‘dangerous’. This circumspection function necessitates that concentration be placed not on normality but on anomalies.

b) Since concepts like ‘delinquency’ and ‘‘dangerous’’ individuality are produced within the truth regime and are not to be considered as empirical concepts they provide the

normative grid for the organisation and interpretation of 'brute facts'. But normative 'truth' is not enough. To manage an individual it is necessary that both the truth about the individual is 'produced' and also that truth about the individual is 'known' in the sense that we have access to his desires, inclinations, intentions, life history, preferences etc. For the second purpose detailed techniques of observation are to be developed. Prison also provided the arena for this. 'Delinquents' were not only produced in the normative sense but they were also useful in building up the detailed empirical 'truth' about individuals and evolving detailed techniques of observation and surveillance to arrive at this truth. Thus psychology/psychiatry as science (for example) did not only provide the normative grid but also the techniques to develop empirical truth about individuals. It is in this sense that psychology in particular and human sciences in general are empirico-transcendental doubles (see ibid. pp. 225-228)[9]. Thus while the purpose of punishment under the ancien Regime was to make "crime explode into its truth", the purpose of penal system in capitalist order is to know the 'truth' of the 'criminal' (in both senses) .

> "The ideal point of penalty today would be an indefinite discipline: an interrogation without end, an investigation that would be extended without limit to a meticulous and ever more analytical observation, a judgement that would at the same time be the constitution of a file that was never closed, the calculated leniency of a penalty that would be interlaced with the ruthless curiosity of an examination, a procedure that would be at the same time the permanent measure of a gap in relationship to an inaccessible norm and the asymptotic movement that strives to meet in infinity. The public execution was the logical culmination of a procedure governed by the Inquisition. The practice of placing individuals under 'observation' is a natural extension of a justice imbued with disciplinary methods and examination procedures" (ibid. p. 227).

c) a) & b) help in developing techniques for ‘correcting’ ‘‘dangerous individuals", delinquent, criminals not in order to eliminate criminals, delinquents, (that would have been untenable given the immense ‘utility’ function that they perform) but in order to evolve techniques of knowing and pacifying deviations and delinquencies so that managing them remain a possibility and the spectre of the production of unmanageable individuals be avoided. The central theme of the techniques of ‘correction’ and ‘re-education’ is self-discipline. This is the essence of disciplinary technologies since discipline is impossible without self-discipline. Self-discipline is made possible through the production of a ‘soul’ within every individual. This soul is the effect of the production of the truth of an individual in sense a& b and of the employment of the techniques of observation, surveillance and correction. [Truth regime is productive in this sense and is directly related to the capitalist production system in a primordial way]. Soul in this sense is not a chimera or illusion but a real effect of the microphysics of punitive power and the general form of power derived from it, which produces these real effects through its privileged access to the truth of the individual. Truth regime literally produces capitalist individuality. This ‘soul’ is what makes possible self-surrender to the eternal logic of capital. As Foucault puts it:

> “ . . . (the soul) exists, it has reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished – and, in a more general way, on those one supervises, trains and corrects, over madmen, children at home and at school, the colonised, over those who are stuck at a machine and supervised for the rest of their lives. This is the historical reality of this soul, which, unlike the soul represented by Christian theology, is not born in sin and subject to punishment, but is born rather out of methods of punishment, supervision and constraint. This real, non-corporal soul is not a substance; it is the element in which are articulated the effects of a certain type of power and the reference of a certain type of knowledge, the machinery by which the power relations give rise to a possible corpus of knowledge, and knowledge extends and reinforces the

> effects of this power. On this reality-reference, various concepts have been constructed and domains of analysis carved out: psyche, subjectivity, personality, consciousness, etc.; on it have been built scientific techniques and discourses and the moral claims of humanism. But let there be no misunderstanding: it is not that a real man, the object of knowledge, philosophical reflection or technical intervention, has been substituted for the soul, the illusion of the theologians. **The man described for us, whom we are invited to free, is already in himself the effect of a subjection much more profound than himself**. A 'soul' inhabits him and brings him to existence, which is itself a factor in the mastery that power exercises over the body. The soul is the effect and instrument of a political anatomy; the soul is the prison of the body. (Ibid. pp. 29-30 emphasis added).

Combining these three functions prison provides the laboratory where the 'truth' of individual is produced which is indispensable for the production and reproduction of a manageable subjectivity. Foucault gives the example of the penal colony of Mettray to describe how this prison laboratory worked in concerto. The task of this prison laboratory was to produce individuals that were both 'docile' and capable. The role of "the chiefs and their deputies at Mettray" was akin to the role of later day psychiatrists, educationists and social scientists: "They were in a sense technicians of behaviour: engineers of conduct, orthopaedists of individuality"(ibid. p. 294). Their method of doing this is aptly summarised by Foucault in the following words:

> " . . . they directed the orderly movements of groups of in-mates, physical exercises, military exercises, rising in the morning, going to bed at night, walks to the accompaniment of bugle and whistle they taught gymnastics; they checked cleanliness, supervised bathing. Training was accompanied by permanent observation; **a body of knowledge was being constantly built up from the everyday behaviour of the inmates; it was organised as an instrument of perpetual assessment** . . . . The modelling of body produces a knowledge of the individual the apprenticeship of the techniques induces modes of behaviour and the acquisition of skills is inextricably linked with

> instrument of power relations; strong, skilled agricultural workers are produced; in this very work, provided it is technically supervised, submissive subjects are produced and a dependable body of knowledge built up about them. This disciplinary technique exercised upon the body had a double effect: a 'soul' to be known and a subjection to be maintained. (ibid. pp. 294-295 emphasis added).

The result of all this exercise? One immediate result is described by Foucault (and it is telling) quoting Ferrus' **Des prisonniers** (1850):

> "One result vindicated this work of training: in 1848, at a moment when 'the fever of revolution fired the imagination of all, when the schools at Angers, La Fleche, Alfort, even the boarding schools, rose up in rebellion, the inmates of Mettray were calmer than ever' (ibid. p. 295).

But there were more far reaching results than this. These concrete practices of controlled production of 'criminals' and evolvement of techniques of production of truth and processes of training around it, provided the bases and conditions for the emergence of social sciences in general and particularly psychology/psychiatry. As Foucault puts it:

> "The carceral texture of society assures both the real capture of the body and its perpetual observation; it is, by its very nature, the apparatus of punishment that conforms most completely to the new economy of power and the instrument for the formation of knowledge that this very economy needs. . . in an even more general way, the method of examination has been able to spread so widely throughout society, and to give rise in part to the sciences of man, one of the great instruments for this has been the multiplicity and close overlapping of the various mechanisms of incarceration. I am not saying that the human sciences emerged from the prison. But, if they have been able to be formed and to produce so many profound changes in the episteme, it is because they have been conveyed by a specific and new modality of power: a certain policy of the body, a certain way of rendering the group of men 'docile' and useful. This policy required the involvement of definite relations of knowledge in relations of power; it called for a technique of overlapping subjection and objectification; it brought

> with it new procedures of individualisation. **The carceral network constituted one of the armatures of this power-knowledge that has made the human sciences historically possible**. Knowable man (soul, individuality, consciousness, conduct, whatever it is called) is the object-effect of this analytical investment, of this domination-observation" (ibid. pp. 304-305 emphasis added).

This move from practice to the threshold of scientificity gave the practices of normalisation, a sort of objectivity and 'scientificity', which obscures and camouflages the origin of these practices of normalisation and their strategic intents. It also makes it possible to apply the practices first initiated around prison to other institutional settings and to society at large, creating a 'carceral' society. Thus there should be no surprising the fact "that cellular prison, with its regular chronologies, forced labour, its authorities of surveillance and registration, its experts in normality, who continue and multiply the function of the judge, should have become the modern instruments of penalty". Similarly there should be no surprise in the fact "that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals which all resemble prison" (ibid. pp. 27-28). Why should there be an element of surprise in this when we live in a society which is modelled after a prison, a society whose real architects ware not Kant and Hegel but Bentham (Foucault 1994 vol. II p. 594). No wonder Foucault considered "(P)anoptism (as) a technological invention in the order of power, comparable with the steam engine in the order of production" (PK p. 71)[10]. Thus the main function of the 'controlled' experimentation carried out in the prison and related institutions was to develop specific technologies around the body and soul of individual (hence his being) for the purpose of 'the transformation of individuals' (ibid. p. 39). The purpose of this particular individuation was to produce and reproduce a manageable subjectivity. There were two things very significant about this controlled experimentation. The technology was generalisable. The techniques of "establish(ing) dossiers, systems of marking and classifying, the integrated accounting of

individual records" (ibid. P. 71) were capable of being used in such diverse settings as schools, barracks, hospitals, government agencies, commerce, etc. Second this controlled experimentation provided the basis and condition for "the emergence of human sciences" (ibid. p. 61), which provide the truth and techniques necessary for the production, reproduction and justification of capitalist individuality. This gives to social scientists and experts the superior status that they have in the capitalist system. Thus creating one pole of the truth regime that has been the condition of the formation and development of capitalism and means of its continued sustenance.

The second pole is the system of the production of the truth of population as a whole, hence a way of totalisation. Capitalism does not only require a certain sort of individuation but also a certain specified sort of totalisation (socialisation?). Hence capitalism does not only need the continued production and reproduction of manageable individuals but also of manageable populations. This has been very crucial for capitalism. Capitalism as an urban phenomenon has always been haunted by the scenarios of urban riots, disorders, epidemics etc. that could have been disastrous for continued capital accumulation. The architects and managers of capitalism knew from the outset that it was not sufficient to produce manageable individuals to control populations as a whole; population was more than the sum total of individuals, who constitute it. Hence the need to treat 'population' as an independent phenomenon and hence the need to produce the 'truth' and evolve technology for the production and reproduction of manageable population. This corresponds to what Foucault calls the police function, the original eighteenth and nineteenth century meaning of police where police function is to maintain 'order' (PK p. 170), in the broader sense of the production and reproduction of manageable 'population' and foreclosing any possibility of 'population'

being able to transgress this management and the possibility of populations being managed/organised in any other way (cf. DP pp. 215-216, PPC pp. 46-63, MC p. 25, FR pp. 240-242).

As is the case with the production of manageable subjectivity for the production of manageable population the dual requirements of ‘‘docility’’ and ‘utility’ must be catered to. Hence the need to produce and know the ‘truth’ of population, methods of ‘knowing’ population and develop procedures of correcting populations so that the ‘population’ be governed in a way that increases the utility and productivity of ‘population’ without making it ungovernable. Hence the need for ‘sciences’ and body of truth proper to ‘population’ and the corresponding experts of ‘population’, the urban planners, demographers, etc. ‘Medicine’ and other related activities initially provided the possibility of access to ‘population’ and the possibility and opportunity of intervention in people’s life both in their individuality and in their collectivity. Thus for example “in the early nineteenth century”:

> “. . . people appear who make it their business to involve themselves in other people’s lives, health, nutrition, housing; then, out of this confused set of function there emerge certain personages, institutions, forms of knowledge: public hygiene, inspectors, social worker, psychologists. And we are now seeing a whole proliferation of different categories of social work.
>
> Naturally it’s medicine which has played the basic role as the common denominator. Its discourse circulated from one instance to the next. It was in the name of medicine both that people came to inspect the layout of houses and equally, that they classified individuals as insane, criminal, or sick" (PK p. 62).

Thus on the similar pattern and in the same sequence as we saw regarding individualising discourses and techniques, a discourse and techniques of knowing and correcting (hence another pole of truth regime) population was formed which were aimed at producing a population which would be simultaneously productive and manageable.

2.2 (iii) Capitalist State

The state may be defined as the structure of legitimate obediences. Foucault uses the word state in two senses: limited and broad. The limited sense of the word state corresponds to the ensemble of coercive and administrative institutions, what Foucault calls "**institutions** of power" (HS p. 141 emphasis retained). But Foucault claims that these great "institutions of power" are supplemented by and depend upon "the rudiment of anatomo – and bio-politics created . . . as **techniques** of power present at every level of the social body and utilised by very diverse institutions (the family and the army, school and the police, individual medicine and the administration of collective bodies). . ." (ibid.). Foucault's insight is that the structures of legitimate obediences are not only saturated in the 'institutions of power' but on the other hand are permeated throughout the social body. The penetration of these structures (relations) of legitimate obediences was made possible by the invention of what Foucault interchangeably calls 'society' and 'population'. Population is defined as "a group of beings living in a given area" (PPC p. 83). Thus society can be understood as individuals in their relations, where relations would include both consensual and coercive relations. The innovation of the bourgeoisie was to create this concept of society and 'population' and turn them into the object of "government". It was said that government not only has to deal with a territory, with a domain and with its subjects, but that it also has to deal with a complex and independent reality that has it own laws and mechanisms of reactions its regulation as well as its possibilities of disturbance" (FR p. 242). The concepts of 'society' and 'population' as the object of government provide the way of penetration for the structures of the legitimate

obediences (power relations) deep into the social body. In capitalist societies "power relations are rooted in the system of social networks" (SP p. 224). It is through these 'power' relations rooted in the system of social network and its allied micro institutions of power such as the school, the hospital, etc, that the state has been able to have access to and the ability to structure relationships:

> "It is certain that in the contemporary societies the state is not simply one of the forms or the specific situations of the exercise of power – even if it is the most important – but that in a certain way all other forms of power relation must refer to it. But this is not because they are derived from it; it is rather power relations have come more and more under state control . . . . In referring here to the restricted sense of the word **government** one could say that power relations have been progressively governmentalised, that is to say, elaborated, rationalised, and centralised in the form of or under the auspices of state institution" (ibid. emphasis retained).

In a similar fashion it is through the power relations rooted in the system of social networks that the state has been able to have access to and structure relations between self and self i.e. to individualise. As Foucault puts it:

> "I don't think that we should consider the 'modern state' as an entity which was developed above individuals, ignoring what they are and even their very existence, but on the contrary as a very sophisticated structure, in which individual can be integrated, under the condition: that this individuality would be shaped in a new form, and submitted to a set of very specific patterns" (ibid. p. 214).

It is here that we arrive at the second and broader conception of the state. In this broader sense the state would include both the state in the restricted sense and the whole power relations rooted in the social network system. This can be further elaborated/understood with

reference to the concept of government. While state in the limited sense corresponds to the restricted sense of government referred to above in the quote from Foucault (SP p. 224), the state in the broader sense of the word corresponds to the broader sense of the government to include both the government of individual (government of individualisation) and the government of 'population'. In this way state in the broader sense is not an institution but a particular rationality of government, a form of political power (PPC p. 24). It is to this broader sense of the state Foucault is referring to when be writes:

> " . . . since the sixteenth century a new political form of power has been continuously developing. This new political structure . . . is the state" (SP p. 213).

It is the sense that state, has been the condition of the "formation and development" of capitalism and can be termed as a capitalist state.

The capitalist state is a totally new phenomenon in the known history of statehood. The way this is so can be understood by contrasting the capitalist state with the forms of state that existed before.

As against feudal societies where the state was essentially 'separated' from the individual and society in the modern period this separation between state and society cannot be maintained. In feudal societies state functioned largely in negative terms in the sense that its basic relationship with individuals and society was that of prohibition and inhibition. In feudal societies "power of the sovereign over his subjects could be exercised in an absolute and unconditional way, but only in cases where the sovereign's very existence was in jeopardy; a sort of right of rejoinder . . . the power of life and death was not an absolute

privilege: it was conditioned by the defence of the sovereign and his own survival" (HS p. 135). State in feudal societies did not posses nor did it need the power over individuals and the social body that is the hallmark of the present times. The power the state possessed over the individual and society was essentially negative: "The sovereign exercised his right of life only by exercising his right to kill, or by refraining from killing; he evidenced his power over life only through the death he was capable of requiring. The right which was formulated as the "power of life and death" was in reality the right to **take** life or **let** live" (ibid. p. 136 emphasis retained). The feudal state swings between the two termination points of taking life or letting live, it has no power over life in its positivity neither has it any interest in seeking such a power. The feudal state's relation to life has been pure negativity. A society "in which power was exercised mainly as a means of deduction (**prelevement**), a subtraction mechanism, a right to appropriate a portion of wealth . . . Power in this instance was essentially a right of seizure: of things, time, bodies, and ultimately life itself: it culminated in the privilege to seize hold of life in order to suppress it" (ibid.).

A new form of state has emerged however in the present era. If the previous form of state swung between the function of taking life or letting live this new state assigns itself the task of "life administration" (ibid.). Power in the capitalist state is not exercised "in the name of the sovereign who must be defended" but in the name of "the existence of everyone", in the name of the "entire population". The modern capitalist state takes the responsibility for and "guarantees" the "individual's continued existence" by assuming right to manage life. Thus modern state power is "exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large scale phenomenon of population" (ibid. p. 137). While the feudal state was centred on the phenomenon of death, the capitalist state is centered on life; it legitimises itself as the manager of life. In feudal societies "in the passage from this world to other, death was the

manner in which a terrestrial sovereignty was relieved by another, singularly more powerful sovereignty; the pageantry that surrounded it was in the category of political ceremony". On the other hand in capitalist societies "it is over life, throughout its unfolding, that (state) power establishes its dominion; death is (the) power's limit, the moment that escapes it; death become the most secret aspect of existence, the most 'private' " (ibid. p. 138)[11]. Hence death and with it all extreme experiences related to death become the only route in modern capitalist society to escape the tyranny of the state. It seems that the tyranny of the state over life can only be transcended by relinquishing life itself. Hence the recurrence of obsession with death and recurrence of this "determination to die" emerges as a great scandal and "one of the first astonishment of a society in which political power had assigned itself the task of administering life" (ibid. p. 139). Modern power even takes life in the name of life and legitimises this in the name of the preservation of life: "Wars are no longer waged in the name of (the) sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilised for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital. It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many to be killed" (ibid. p. 137).

The change in the nature of the state mentioned above has widened its ambit to include 'life' in its totality. In this sense the capitalist state includes 'every thing' [this corresponds to the early modern concept of 'police' as found in cameralism and German polizeiwissenchaft (PPC p. 79)]. Thus the capitalist state is a 'totalising' force in the manner the feudal state was not. It must administer life as a whole. What Meszaros has written about the totalising character of capital is equally true about the capitalist state[12]: " (T) he capital system is (the)

first one in history which institutes itself as an unexceptional and irresistible totaliser". (1995 p. 41).

Capitalist "state power", Foucault writes, "is both an individualising and a totalsing form of power. Never, I think, in the history of human societies-even in the old Chinese society – has there been such a tricky combination in the same political structure of individualising techniques, and of totalisation procedures" (SP p. 213). Nothing escapes the capitalist state[13].

This power of the capitalist state is based on the emergence of a new type of power: bio power and disciplinary power. A new type of state has emerged in the west because the "western state has integrated in a new political shape, an old power technique which originated in Christian institutions. We can call this power technique the pastoral power" (ibid.). Bio and disciplinary power is a modern reinterpretation of Christian pastoral power (ibid. p. 214). This reinterpretation has been made possible due to 'profound transformation' in the basic mode of power. Power does not any longer work primarily as negativity, as a deduction. It takes the form of positivity: " 'Deduction' has tended to be no longer the major form of power but merely one element among others, working to incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimise, and organise the forces under it: a power bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them" (HS p. 136).

This new power is salvation oriented but its conception of salvation is the inversion of the original Christian conceptions. In capitalism the state no longer aims at "leading people to their salvation in the next world, but rather ensuring it in this world". Welfarism takes the form of this worldly salvation and "the word salvation takes on different meanings: health, well being (that is, sufficient wealth, standard of living), security, protection against

accident" (ibid. p. 215). By incorporating Christian pastoral techniques, while transforming their character and incorporating them into its mechanisms, the modern capitalist state stretches its reach to the soul and body of individuals on the one hand and to the social body at large on the other hand.

Through distinguishing bio from disciplinary power Foucault tries to bring forth the different aspects of this 'secularised' version of pastoral power.

By 'bio-power' Foucault wanted to emphasis the form of power which does not only cater for the needs of the individuals but also looks after 'population' as a whole. On the other hand 'discipline' is what is concerned with individual in his specificity and concreteness. But these two forms of power should not be construed as antithetical in nature, they are the 'two poles' of the same phenomenon (HS p. 139). What links these two forms of power (apart from that they both are life administering powers), is the phenomenon of body. While the 'bio power' is 'focused' on the species body' the disciplines are 'centered on body as machine' (ibid.).

'Bio power' is concerned with the 'human species', "the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary" (ibid.) The purpose of this was 'the regulation of the population" (ibid.). For the first time in the human history 'specie' and 'population' as a whole became the object of government: (F)or the first time in history, scientific categories – specie, population, and others – rather then juridical ones become the object of political attention in a consistent and sustained fashion" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1983 p. 134).

‘Disciplines’ on the other hand are concerned with body “as a machine: its disciplining, the optimisation of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls . . . ." (HS p. 139). As already mentioned exercise of ‘disciplinary’ power over the body gave rise to the reality of the modern ‘soul’ (HS p. 29).

The emergent ‘soul’ acted as an instrument through which 'discipline' becomes ‘self-discipline’. Thus the surplus power used in the earlier phases of capitalism is justified on the ground that in the long run it reduces the need of the ‘surplus’ exercise of power. This corresponds to what some commentators have read as a transition from early capitalism’s disciplinary society to present day control society (Negri and Hardt 2000 pp. 22-23, Delueze 1988).

Combination of these four aspects (i.e. power over species and population, body and soul) gave formidable power to the capitalist state over the individual and society that is unprecedented in history. It permeates through and through the whole arena of life, its only limit is death. Seemingly there is no escape from it within life[14]. As Foucault puts it:

> "For the first time in history . . . biological existence was reflected in political existence; the fact of living was no longer an inaccessible substrate that only emerged from time to time, amid the randomness of death and its fatality; part of it passed into knowledge’s field of control and power’s sphere of intervention. Power would no longer be dealing simply with legal subjects over whom the ultimate dominion was death, but with living beings, and the mastery it would be able to exercise over them would have to be applied at the level of life itself; it was the taking charge of life, more than the threat of death, that gave power its access even to the body. (HS pp. 142-143).

2.2 (iv) Management of Freedom through Freedom

The originality of Foucault's analysis lies in his realisation that capitalism manages freedom through freedom and not through repression. This is the basic insight of the rejection of the so called 'repressive hypothesis'. The crux of Foucault's insight is that though capitalism is concerned both with the 'production and protection of wealth' (Neocleous and Elden 1997 p. 8) the production function is the main stay of capitalism and protection function is normally performed through and by the production function. True; constrains, repressions have their place in the capitalist system especially in its earlier phases but it has been relatively easy for the capitalist system to dispense with these limits.

> "For a long time people imagined that the strictness of the sexual codes, in the from that we know them, was indispensable to so called "capitalist" societies. Yet the lifting of the codes and the dislocation of prohibitions have probably been carried out more easily than people thought they would (which certainly seemed to indicate that their purpose was not what it was believed to be); and the problem of an ethics as a form to be given to one's behaviour and life has arisen once more. In sum people were wrong when they believed that all morality resided in prohibition and that the lifting of these prohibitions in itself solved the question of ethics" (PPC pp. 262-263).

Prohibition may have been the mainstay of early capitalism when it first flourished around monarchies and was anchored in the Protestant ethics of which Foucault speaks in so memorable terms in **Madness and Civilisation** (pp. 56-57), but capitalism is an innovative force, and has left behind the political order of monarchies and the ethical order of Protestantism. Power in its modern post monarchist post Protestant phase does not work

primarily through prohibition; it functions by producing and liberating what it needs to control:

> "At the cross roads of body and soul, of health and morality, of education and training, childern's sex became both a target and an instrument of power. A specific "sexuality of children" was constituted- precautions, dangerous, constantly in need of supervision.
>
> This resulted in a sexual misery of childhood and adolescence from which our own generations still have not recovered, **but the objective was not to forbid, but to use childhood sexuality, suddenly become important and mysterious, as a network of power over children"** (ibid. pp. 113-114 emphasis added).

Thus it is not a question of denying the existence of repression **but of denying prohibition and forbiddance as the mode of repression.** Thus operation of power in modern capitalism "is not ensured by right but by technique, not by law but by normalisation, not by punishment but by control, methods that are employed on all levels and in forms that go beyond the state and its apparatus" (HS p. 89).

In the capitalist system "interdiction, the refusal, the prohibition, far from being essential forms of power, are only its limits, power in its frustrated or extreme forms. The relations of power are, above all productive" (PPC p. 118). Capitalism as 'a political ordering of life' developed 'not through an enslavement of others but through an affirmation of self' (HS p. 123). Thus the evolution of capitalism consisted in "the self affirmation of one class rather than the enslavement of another: a defence, a protection, a strengthening and exaltation that were eventually extended to others – at the cost of different transformations – as a means of social control and political subjugation" (ibid.)

The reason for the centrality of 'production' rather than 'protection' and even 'protection' mainly through production is the fact that for its continued development and sustenance

capitalism needs the maximum enhancement of the ‘utility’ of each and every member without any exclusion otherwise its progress would be stymied. The meaning of governance in a capitalist system is to govern in such a way that the ‘utility’ of each and every member is maximised and converge towards the singularity of accumulation for the sake of accumulation and that this system is protected from any disruptions or distractions. This is government through ‘affirmation’ in contrast to government through ‘enslavement’. Thus in a system like this constraints, repression are to be used sparingly and exceptionally and even when used they must be masked. In modern capitalist societies ‘power is tolerable only on the condition that it masks a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms’ (ibid. p. 86). Hence the conception of negative liberty as absence of power: “power as a pure limit set on freedom is, at least in our society, the general form of its acceptability” (ibid.) i.e. its legitimacy.

Foucault’s claim is that in capitalism government of diversity is maintained through freedom itself and not through repression. Capitalism’s interests are not fulfilled by curbing and limitations per se. Capitalism has evolved a system of government whose condition of operationalisation is freedom and immanence. Foucault defines "government’ as the structure (ing) of the possible field of action of others" (PPC p. 221). Capitalism realises, according to Foucault that freedom is the essential element of ‘government’ (management) in the sense that capitalism recognises the ‘double’ character of freedom. To desire freedom is not only to expand the arena of choice (diversity) but it is also to make oneself governable (manageable). Hence the impossibility of governing/managing those who reject freedom (cf ibid. pp. 221-222)[15].

Here we can appreciate the phenomenon of liberalism[16] and its importance for the development of capitalism. Liberalism is important for two reasons. Liberalism recognises that "if one governed too much, one did not govern at all – that one provoked results contrary to those one desired" (FR p. 242). Second liberalism realises that freedom is not only a principle of intransigence, it can also be a principle of government. As Rose puts it:

> " . . . whilst Proudhon, writing in the mid nineteenth century, represents government as the antithesis of freedom, the achievement of liberalism as an art of government was to begin to govern through making people free. Liberalism 'freed' persons in the realms of the market, civil society, the family-it placed them outside the legitimate scope of political authorities, subject only to the limits of the law. Yet the 'freeing' of these zones was accompanied by the invention of a whole series of attempts to shape and manage conduct within them in desirable ways. On the one hand, the 'public' activities of free citizens were to be regulated by codes of civility reason and orderliness. On the other, the private conduct of free citizens was to be civilised by equipping them with languages and techniques of self-understanding and self-mastery. Freedom thus becomes inextricably linked to a norm of civility; form this moment on, even when freedom is practiced as calculated resistance to civility, its exercise entails extrapolating, parodying or inverting its valuations" (Rose 1993 p. 6).

Thus 'formal juridical liberties and rights' conferred by liberalism are the way through which government is made possible; in two senses. First that "the man described for us, whom we are invited to free, is already in himself the effect of a subjection much more profound than himself" (DP. 30). Second, the formal rights are conferred to the extent that the individual lends himself to governance and management. The formal rights are also the justification (and mask) for indispensable inequalities and disciplines to which every body must be susceptible and through which every body must pass. As Foucault writes:

> "Historically, the process through which the bourgeoisie became in the course of the eighteenth century the politically dominant class was masked by the establishment of an explicit, coded and formally egalitarian juridical framework, made possible by the organisation of a parliamentary,

> representative regime. But the development and generalisation of disciplinary mechanisms constituted the other, dark side of these processes. The general juridical form that guaranteed a system of rights that were egalitarian in principle was supported by (the) tiny, everyday, physical mechanisms, by all those systems of micro-power that are essentially non-egalitarian and asymmetrical that we call the disciplines. And although, in a formal way, the representative regime makes it possible, directly or indirectly, with or without relays for the will of all to form the fundamental authority of sovereignty, the disciplines provide, at the base, a guarantee of the submission of forces and bodies. **The real, corporal disciplines constituted the foundation of the formal, juridical liberties**. The contract may have been regarded as the ideal foundation of law and political power; panopticism constituted the technique, universally widespread, of coercion. It continued to work in depth on the juridical structures of society, in order to make the effective mechanisms of power function in opposition to the formal framework that it had acquired. The 'Enlightenment', which discovered the liberties, also invented the disciplines". (DP p. 222 emphasis added).

Thus we can conclude that capitalism allows diversification and multiplication on the condition that it be manageable and convergable to the singularity of continuing capital accumulation.

2.2(v) Concluding Remarks

To conclude this section we can note that the ultimate role of the three regimes which Foucault has analysed as the conditions of the formation and development of capitalism is to make sure that diversity converges to singularity of accumulation for the sake of accumulation. This is the necessary limit on the ambit of freedom in a capitalist system since freedom ultimately is the freedom to accumulate. Now for Foucault imposition of singularity over diversification is the limiting of freedom and this limitation on freedom and diversification is unacceptable. This is the logical out come of Foucault's commitment to the unfinished project of freedom. But to deny regulation over diversification is to deny capitalism, since capitalism, as a system can not work without imposition of singularity over

diversity. Hence Foucault must, at least in principle, be committed to the overthrowing of capitalism: not in the limited sense of overthrowing capitalism in the narrow sense of a system of production but as a 'moral order'. To destroy capitalism as a moral order requires the overthrow of its three regimes, i.e. truth, subjectivisation, and power (as a capitalist governmental rationality). Thus Foucault's primary focus is to overthrow these three regime in a way that there overthrow would lead to a **different** truth, subjectivisation and power regime whose main characteristic would be that it would allow the expansion of the ambit of diversity without evolving mechanisms to gear this diversity back towards any new singularity.

2.3 Market State and Freedom

Where does the market fit into this analysis of the conditions of the possibility of capitalism? To answer this question we need to first define the market. The market may be defined as the arena of capital accumulation. Since we can speak of capital accumulation both in general and particular terms we can also speak of the market in these two senses relating to general and particular accumulation processes. Thus we can define Market (with capital M) as arena of accumulation in general while market (with small m) can be defined as the arena of particular accumulation.

The capitalist state on the other hand is the arena of accumulation of men. As far as the relationship between the state as governmental rationality is concerned it is the condition of the possibility of Market as the arena of the accumulation in general in the literal sense. Not only governmental rationality but also the capitalist subjectivisation regime and the truth regime are the conditions of the possibility of Market. Thus the emergence of Market in this sense depends upon and is conditioned upon:

- The legetimation of certain ways of being governed. The individual and the population can be governed legitimately on the condition that this governance is life enhancing (salvatory in this world).

- The emergence of and legetimation of a subjectivity that is solely concerned with maximising its own ‘utility’ and thus willing to succumb his self to disciplines which are necessary to maximise ‘utility’ and in the process making himself governable in a certain way.

- The emergence of a truth regime that is wholly centred on the above two.

These three conditions are necessary for the possibility of accumulation in general and hence for the possibility of Market as the arena of accumulation in general. Thus the emergence of Market in general is a political process in the sense that the basic principle on which Market works are in built in the process of and the method for accumulation of men (the so called 'political take off of the west'). It is not only that Market ‘uses’ political force for its ends, more than that, Market is able to use political forces because these political forces are meant to be the political forces of Market. Foucault brings this out very clearly in his description of the intermingling of ‘utility’ and ‘governance’ in disciplines:

> The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, nor at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relationship that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful, and conversely. What was then being formed was a policy of coercions that act upon the body, a calculated manipulation of its elements, its gestures, its behaviour. The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it breaks it down and rearranges it. A ‘political anatomy’, which was also a ‘mechanics of power’, was being born; it defined how one may have a hold over others’ bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one

> wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines. Thus discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, 'docile' bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience). In short, it dissociates power from the body; on the one hand, it turns it into an 'aptitude', a 'capacity', which it seeks to increase; on the other hand, it reverses the course of the energy, the power that might result from it, and turns it into a relationship of strict subjection. If economic exploitation separates the force and the product of labour, let us say that disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and a increased domination. (DP pp. 137-138 emphasis added).

Thus the political process does not only provide the mask and justification for the economic processes in capitalism it does more than this. The political process of the accumulation of men is a 'productive' process in it self, not just a tool of the production process. It can become the tool of production only because it is itself a productive process on which the economic process of production depends literally. The capitalist political order "produces; it producer reality; it produces domains of object and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production" (ibid. p. 194). Without this prior production economic production is unthinkable. Thus it is not just that the general juridical form of power and its accompanied system of formal rights are the conditions of the possibility of Market, a justification of the asymmetric and unequalising disciplines of Market. The story is subtler than this. The asymmetrical, unequalising disciplines of Market are preceded by and conditioned upon asymmetrical, unequalising disciplines operationalised at the political level, on the level where accumulation of men takes place. Apart from this productive/positive relationship between the order of accumulation of men and Market there is also a limiting negative function of the political order of capital. This limiting function consists in pooling the process of utility maximisation in such a manner that it only leads to

accumulation of capital and all other possibilities are foreclosed. This is what Foucault has in mnid when he writes that "Discipline increases the forces of body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience)" (op. cit). Thus while the positive side of the regime of accumulation of men makes Market possible its negative side assures that transgression against Market (accumulation in general) is impossible. Again this function is not instrumental but intrinsic to the regime of the accumulation of men. Foreclosure of the possibility of transgression against capital is in built in the regime of the accumulation of men. Thus the 'mechanism' associated with the regime of accumulation of men "are applied (mainly) not to transgression against a 'central law' but to the apparatus of production – 'commerce' and 'industry' . . . ." (ibid. p. 308).

What I have tried to explain in the above is the fact that according to Foucault's understanding the relationship between the political order of capital and its economic order is intrinsic and necessary and not instrumental and contingent. Viewed from this perspective (for example) marketisation of society or state would not be conceived as a befalling on society and state of something of an alien mechanism which deprive them of there true 'vocation'. It would be conceived as something, which is inherently present in the constitution of a capitalist state and society and manifests itself in degrees corresponding to the historical level of a capitalist order. Thus at the end of this discussion we can note three type of relations between the regime of accumulation of men and Market as the arena of accumulation in general.

- The regime of accumulation of men provides the conditions in the form of disciplining individuals and 'population' so that they might be **willing** and **able** to succumb to the disciplines of Market.

- ❖ The regime of accumulation of men makes sure that the possibilities of transgression to these disciplines are foreclosed.

- ❖ It also masks and justifies the disciplines of its own system and that of the Market.

What we have seen above regarding the relationship between the regime of accumulation of men in general with the Market may be applied to actually existing (particular) regimes of the accumulation of men and actually existing (particular) markets. True, capitalism as it has existed historically has different levels of correspondence to its generality and there have been strategic shifts in the history of capitalism which Foucault clearly recognises, however we can safely discern a definite level of correspondence with this generality of the relationship between the regime of accumulation of men and Market in all existing capitalist regimes.

A major difference should be noted however at the outset. While the relationship between the regime of the accumulation of men is the precondition of the formation and development of Market, the relationship between actually existing (particular) regimes of accumulation of men and that of actually existing (particular) markets have been reciprocal. As Foucault puts it:

> "The disciplinary pyramid constituted the small cell of power with which the separation, co-ordination and supervision of tasks was imposed and made efficient; and analytical partitioning of the gestures and bodily forces constituted an operational schema that could easily be transferred from the groups to be subjected to the mechanisms of production; the massive projection of military methods into industrial organisation was an example of this modelling of the division of labour following the model laid down by the schemata of power. But, on the other hand, the technical analyses of the process of production, its 'mechanical' breaking – down, were projected on to the labour force whose task it was to implement it: the constitution of those disciplinary machines in which the individual forces that

they bring together are composed into a whole and therefore increased is the effect of the projection" (DP. p. 221).

Having this caveat in mind we can now turn back to our initial task of describing how the actually existing (particular) regimes of accumulation of men form the condition of the functioning of actually existing (particular) markets. We shall explain this by the way of a few interconnected points:

❖ Individuals go through 'disciplines' (literally) before entering the arena of market through different institutions like family (early protestant family institution), school, universities, hospital, asylum (different psychological and psychiatric institutions through their historic mutations), prison, penal colonies, armies etc. These institution work on the dual principle of maximising the 'utility' of individuals while minimising their ability to transgress the singularity of capital accumulation. Thus an individual is made 'subject' to capital even before entering the arena of market.

❖ Not only the individual but 'society' (population) is 'disciplined' on similar lines. The purpose is to maximise the utility of 'society' as a whole while minimising its ability to transgress the 'law' of capital. The disciplinary techniques that were projected on to the labour force were also projected on to the 'society' as whole. Thus making 'society' organised on lines that were parallel and conducive to market processes.

❖ The democratic state historically provides the mask and justification to extend disciplinary techniques inside and outside markets, thus creating condition in which increasingly asymmetric and unequalising relations and their extension is made possible. The welfare state provides the opportunity to intervene in society and its organisation on the lines

of the market, it literally created capitalist society, capitalist population and the first capitalist collectivit(ies) in history.

❖ Relevant in this context is the ‘police apparatus' mentioned earlier. The ‘police apparatus' is linked to the 'state apparatus'; to the 'centre of political sovereignty’, it works within the ambit of ‘disciplinary power’ and is a productive as well as a limiting apparatus. As early as in **MC** Foucault defines police as “the totality of measures which make work possible and necessary for all those who would not live without it . . .” (p. 46). Again “Down to the end of the **ancient regime,** the term ‘police’ does not signify at least not exclusively the institution of police in the modern sense; ‘police’ is the ensemble of mechanisms serving to ensure order, the properly channelled growth of wealth and the conditions of preservation of health in general’ (PK p. 170). Thus police has as its main function the production and protection of wealth and protection of general conditions of health (which is obviously related to the first two functions). The production of wealth function includes all kinds of “economic regulation (the circulation of commodities, manufacturing processes, the obligations of trades people both to one another and to there clientele)". The protection of wealth function is constituted of the " 'measures of public order' (surveillance of dangerous individuals, expulsion of vagabonds and if necessary beggars and the pursuit of criminals" (ibid. p. 170). The production and protection of health function includes the "general rules of hygiene (checks on the quality of foodstuffs sold, the water supply and the cleanliness of streets)" [ibid. pp. 170-171].

To elaborate on the protection of wealth function a bit further. Apart from the functions mentioned above and other routine functions, the central task of police has also been to thwart and foil the possibility of revolution, the possibility of transgressing the order of

capital: “For the bourgeoisie the main danger against which it had to be protected, that which had to be avoided at all costs, was armed uprising, was the armed people, was workers taking to the streets in assault against the government” (PK p. 16). It is the function of police in broader sense to protect wealth protect markets through foreclosing the possibility of revolution.

We can sum up our brief discussion of the relationship between the regime of the accumulation of men and actually existing (particular) markets by considering the following passage from Foucault where he discusses the emergence of medical market in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries:

> “The development of a medical market in the form of private clienteles, the extension of a network of personnel offering qualified medical attention, the growth of individual and family demand for health care, the emergence of a clinical medicine strongly centred on individual examination, diagnosis and therapy, the explicitly moral and scientific – and secretly economic – exaltation of ‘private consultation’, in short the **progressive emplacement of what was to become the great medical edifice of the nineteenth century, cannot be divorced from the concurrent organisation of a politics of health,** the consideration of disease as a political and economic problem for social collectivities which they must seek to resolve as a matter of overall policy. ‘Private’ and ‘socialised’ medicine, in their reciprocal support and opposition, both derive from a common global strategy . . . ." (ibid. pp. 166-167 emphasis added).

Thus the emergence of the ‘medical market’ is not seen as the outcome of some quasi natural evolution but of noso politics. And this noso politics is not just centred on state apparatus but in the whole apparatus of accumulation of men:

> "Thus the eighteenth-century problematisation of noso-politics does not correlate with a uniform trend of State intervention in the practice of medicine, but rather with the emergence at a multitude of sites in the social body of health and disease as problems requiring some form or other of collective control

> measures. Rather than being the product of a vertical initiative coming from above, noso-politics in the eighteenth century figures as problem with a number of origins and orientations, being the problem of the health of all as a priority for all, the state of health of a population as a general objective of policy" (ibid. pp. 167-168).

The regime of accumulation of men in general provided the condition for the emergence and development of Market as the arena of accumulation in general. People needed to be disciplined in order to be made eligible for acquiring the formal rights necessary for the functioning of markets. Thus before entering the Market arena individuals and populations were disciplined by political forces. Market disciplines were preceded by and conditioned upon non Market disciplines, "the worker was to be 'freed' to the extent that the enforcement of punitive sanctions against gambling, vagrancy and the like would preclude all means of subsistence other than waged labour, and (the) worker was to be individualised through law against unionisation and collective action. Once constructed and generalised, the dull compulsion of labour market would combine with the disciplinary organisation of time, space and activity in the factory, mill and mine to produce the forms of life and mode of individuality in which docile and utilisable labour would present itself at the work place of its own free will" (Rose 1993 p. 6). Thus one goes through two types of disciplines (first outside the work place) and then at the work place to attain the kind of freedom that is the hallmark of Market. Similarly the actually existing (particular) markers are preceded by and conditioned by the actually existing (particular) regimes of accumulation of men with the proviso that a reciprocal relation exists on this level in the sense that development in one arena can be extrapolated onto the other and crises in one domain can lead to crises or reform or development of new techniques in the other domain.

2.4 Foucault's Critique of the Marxist Critique of Capitalism

There is no doubt that Foucault's analysis of capitalism presented above is carried out in the context of and to a certain extent in opposition to the Marxist analysis of capitalism. However by Marxist analysis Foucault does not mean the work of Marx but a set of Marxist doctrines guarded and monopolised by communist parties. Foucault dreamt of the emergence of "(a) left culture that was not Marxist" in this sense. He wonders about the possibility of the "forms of thought and analysis that are not irrationalistic, that are not coming from the right and that moreover are not reducible to Marxist dogmatism . . .(and) to what extent is it possible to conduct a theoretical, rational, scientific program of research that can surpass the laws and dogmatism of dialectical materialism" (RM pp. 94-95). Foucault goes so far as to pose the question of revolution and its viability as a question of transcending the inherent link between Marxism and revolution. The fundamental question is "(h)ow can European revolutionary movements free themselves from the 'Marx effect' the institutions typical of nineteenth and twentieth century Marxism?… (and it is a matter of) calling (into) question of the equation Marxism = the revolutionary process, an equation that constituted (a) kind of dogma…." (PK p. 57). In this context I would like to briefly investigate the basic differences between Foucault's analysis of capitalism and that of Marxism:

❖ Fundamentally Foucault's analysis differs from Marxist analysis in its rejection of the Marxist concept of ideology. Ideology is rejected as an adequate concept for three reasons. First because "it always stands in virtual opposition to something else which is supposed to count as truth". Second because the concept of ideology refers "to something of the order of a subject" (FR p. 60). This is another way of saying that 'ideology' is an unacceptable

concept because it implies the existence of a universal rationality and a universal truth. But as we have seen Foucault rejects both concepts. According to Foucault “the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientificity or truth, and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truth are produced within discourses which are neither true nor false” (ibid.). This means that Foucault does not reject the truth regime on which capitalism is based because it is ‘false’ and that he is heralding an alternative which is the ‘real’ or superior truth. Far from it. Foucault rejects capitalist truth regime because of the effects it produces in terms of increase in subjection etc. Similarly Foucault does not reject capitalism because it is based on ‘irrationality; not at all. He rejects capitalist rationality in terms of its leading to increased subjection. Thus Foucault rejects ideology as an acceptable concept because he rejects the notion of universal rationality and with it the notion of subject (collective or individual). Foucault's genealogical method on the other hand aims “to arrive at an analysis which can account for the constitution of the subject within a historical framework” (ibid. p. 59). This amounts to saying that there is no universality and different rationalities are constituted within a historical framework and in this respect Marxist rationality is no better than capitalist rationality. Thus Marxism’s aspiration to become a science is criticised because with acceptance of the illusory notion of objectivity it is compelled to ignore the effects of the power of discourses having pretensions of objectivity and scientificity. On the other hand “it is really against the effects of the power of a discourse that is considered to be scientific that genealogy (wages and) must wage its struggle” (PK p. 84). Thus the objection against Marxism is not; why it has not become a science, the objection is why it has: “if we have an objection against Marxism, it lies in the fact that it could effectively be a science”. Foucault sums up his objection in a rhetorical way: “when I

see you straining to establish the scientificity of Marxism I don't really think that you are demonstrating once and for all that Marxism has a rational structure and therefore its prepositions are the outcome of verifiable procedures; for me you are doing something altogether different, you are investing Marxist discourses and those who uphold them with the effects of a power which the West since Medieval times has attributed to science and has reserved for those engaged in scientific discourse" (ibid. p. 85).

The related conception, which Foucault rejects, is that of 'repression' which has been especially popular with the Lacanian and psychoanalytic Marxists. The notion of repression is the outcome of the same notions of objectivity and scientificity in the sense that it is based on the assumption that knowledge and truth are outside power. This leads to a wholly negative conception of power which hampers understanding of capitalism. The "notion of repression is quite inadequate for capturing what is precisely the productive aspect of (capitalist) power" (FR p. 60). The notion of repression can not capture the fact that capitalism is a productive and innovative force. It needs to govern but in the manner that does not diminish the productive capacities of the individuals and population. More than that it constantly needs to increase and keep increasing the productivity of individual and populations, for which it does not require 'repression', it needs inducements. Thus Foucault asks, "if (capitalist) power were never anything but repressive, it never did anything but to say no do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes (capitalist) power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasures, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It (capitalist power) needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression (FR p. 61). Thus the notion of repression has been a hindrance

in carrying out the correct analysis of the workings of capitalism, it also has been tactically a disastrous notion as it leads to the grave underestimation of capitalism's innovative character and its ability to withstand crises.

❖ The second aspect of Marxism, which Foucault rejects, is its economism or economic determinism. This aspect is also related to the concept of ideology. The third reason for the rejection of ideology, which we didn't mention above, makes this clear "ideology stands in a secondary position relative to some thing which functions as its infrastructure, as its material, economic determinant, etc" (FR. p. 60). The rejection of economic determinism is related to the rejection of a basic distinction in Marxism between base and super structure. This distinction is used in Marxism "to propound the idea that the economic structure of society (the base) conditions the existence and forms of the state and social consciousness (the superstructure)" (Larrain p. 42 emphasis removed). As we have seen in Foucault's analysis of capitalism the regime of accumulation of men (which corresponds to Marxism's super structure) is the condition of the possibility of capitalism in general and the particular regimes of accumulation of men are necessary for the existence and continued sustenance of particular accumulation regimes beside that they are tied to each other in a conditioning-conditioned relationship. Moreover a philosophy of relations like that of Foucault cannot in it self subscribe to reductionism which is the hallmark of the base/superstructure distinction in vulgar Marxism. As Foucault puts it: "the reproduction of the relations of production is not the only function served by power. The system of domination and the circuits of exploitation certainly interact, intersect and support each other, but they do not coincide" (PK p. 72). Foucault terms this view as the view of 'an economic functionality of power' (ibid. p. 88) and rejects. According to this view "power is conceived primarily in terms of the role it plays in the maintenance simultaneously of the relations of production and of a class domination

which the development and specific forms of the forces of production have rendered possible. On this view then the historical **raison detre** of political power is to be found in the economy" (ibid. pp. 88-89). The missing link is the state. Political power must reside and concentrate in the state primarily. From this a whole argument for class domination is derived. Since the economy is in the hand of the bourgeoisie, they must have political power too, and since political power is concentrated in the state, the state must be in the hands of the bourgeoisie too. The counter strategy runs almost on similar lines. The state must be captured by the proletariat so as to overthrow the bourgeoisie from the helm of economy and to establish the counter domination of proletariat on economy. The first ingredient of the argument is already rejected in terms of the rejection of economism. The second argument is rejected by Foucault on the basis of his rejection of the Marxist over emphasis on the state apparatus:

> "… one cannot confine oneself to analysing the state apparatus alone if one wants to grasp the mechanisms of power in their detail and complexity. There is a sort of schematism that needs to be avoided here-and which incidentally is not to be found in Marx - that consists of locating power in the state apparatus, making this into the major, privileged capital and almost unique instrument of the power of one class over another. In reality, power in its exercise goes much further, passes through much finer channels, and is much more ambiguous . . . " (ibid. p. 72).

What is lacking in the standard Marxist analysis of capitalism is the concept of capitalist governmental rationality as the basis of state and hence unavailability of the crucial distinction between the narrow and broad senses of the state.

This amounts to and leads to Foucault's rejection of class domination as a sustainable conception. The hegemony of capital does not consist (primarily) in the hegemony of a class, it is fundamentally the hegemony of a particular rationality. The bourgeois class might have

been the bearer of this rationality but this does not amount to saying that the hegemony of capital is the hegemony of bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie became the dominant class because they were the first to subject themselves to capitalist rationality. Historically the bourgeoisie were the first 'subject' of capital[17]. Later on other classes were subjected to the same rationality. In this sense capitalism is an incorporatist system. It is not exclusionist in the sense carried with it by the concept of class domination. What Foucault wrote about the deployment of sexuality (which was the integral part of the development of bio politics) makes it clear that he has no purchase for the concept of class domination:

> "If one writes the history of sexuality in terms of repression, relating this repression to the utilisation of labour capacity, one must suppose that sexual controls were the more intense and meticulous as they were directed at the poorer classes; one has to assume that they followed the path of greatest domination and the most systematic exploitation: the young adult man, possessing nothing more than his life force, had to be the primary target of a subjugation destined to shift the energy available for useless pleasure toward compulsory labour. But this does not appear to be the way things actually happened. **On the contrary, the most rigorous techniques were formed and, more particularly, applied first, with the greatest intensity, in the economically privileged and politically dominant classes.** The direction of consciences, self-examination, the entire long elaboration of the transgressions of the flesh, and the scrupulous detection of concupiscence were all subtle procedures that could only have been accessible to small groups of people. It is true that the penitential method of Alfonso 'de' Ligouri and the rules recommended to the Methodists by Wesley ensured that these procedures would be more widely disseminated, after a fashion; but this was at the cost of a considerable simplification. The same can be said of the family as an agency of control and a point of sexual saturation: it was in the bourgeois or "aristocratic" family that the sexuality of children and adolescents was first problematised, and feminine sexuality medicalised; it was the first to be alerted to the potential pathology of sex, the urgent need to keep it under close watch and to devise a rational technology of correction. It was this family that first became a locus for the psychiatrization of sex. Surrendering to fears, creating remedies, appealing for rescue by learned techniques, generating countless discourses, it was the first to commit itself to sexual erethism. The bourgeoisie began by

considering that its own sex was something important, a fragile treasure, a secret that had to be discovered at all costs. It is worth remembering that the first figure to be invested by the deployment of sexuality, one of the first to be "sexualised," was the "idle" woman. She inhabited the outer edge of the "world," in which she always had to appear as a value, and of the family, where she was assigned a new destiny charged with conjugal and parental obligations. Thus there emerged the "nervous" woman, the woman afflicted with "vapours"; in this figure, the hysterisation of woman found its anchorage point. As for the adolescent wasting his future substance in secret pleasures, the onanistic child who was of such concern to doctors and educators from the end of the eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth, **this was not the child of the people, the future worker who had to be taught the disciplines of the body, but rather the schoolboy, the child surrounded by domestic servants, tutors, and governess, who was in danger of compromising not so much his physical strength as his intellectual capacity, his moral fiber, and the obligation** to preserve a healthy line of descent for his family and his social class. For their part, the working classes managed for a long time to escape the deployment of "sexuality". On the other hand, it is unlikely that the Christian technology of the flesh ever had any importance for them. As for the mechanisms of sexualisation, these penetrated them slowly and apparently in three successive stages" (HS pp. 120-121).

❖ Foucault's rejection of economism and his rejection of class domination is supplemented and buttressed by his rejection of exploitation as the central feature of capitalism. In the Marxist conception "under capitalism, exploitation takes the form of the extraction of surplus value by the class of industrial capitalists from the working class, but other exploiting classes or class fractions share in the distribution of surplus value" (Himmelweit p. 157 deemphasised). As we have seen for Foucault the central feature of capitalism is subjection and not exploitation. Capitalism makes possible the establishment of the regime of subjection only by transcending the regime of exploitation to a certain extent. This is based on Foucault's particular understanding of the relationship between life and history and its balance in the present times. Foucault's view on this may be presented in his own words as follows:

> "… the pressure exerted by the biological on the historical had remained very strong for thousands of years; epidemics and famine were the two great dramatic forms of this relationship that was always dominated by the menace of death. But through a circular process, the economic - and primarily agricultural - development of the eighteenth century, and an increase in productivity and resources even more rapid than the demographic growth it encouraged, allowed a measure of relief from these profound threats: despite some renewed outbreaks, the period of great ravages from starvation and plague had come to a close before the French Revolution; death was ceasing to torment life so directly. But at the same time, the development of the different fields of knowledge concerned with life in general, the improvement of agricultural techniques, and the observations and measures relative to man's life and survival contributed to this relaxation: a relative control over life averted some of the imminent risks of death. In the space for movement thus conquered, and broadening and organising that space, methods of power and knowledge assumed responsibility for the life processes and undertook to control and modify them. Western man was gradually learning what it meant to be a living species in a living world, to have a body, conditions of existence, probabilities of life, an individual and collective welfare, forces that could be modified, and a space in which they could be distributed in an optimal manner. For the first time in history, no doubt, biological existence was reflected in political existence . . ." (HS p. 142).

Thus capitalism's emergence is accompanied by a relative rise of prosperity and with the development of capitalism the space of the relative prosperity expands. Obviously this does not imply the absence of exploitation in a capitalist system. Exploitation exists in the capitalist system but exploitation can not be regarded and treated as the central feature of capitalism and the central explanatory notion in the analysis of capitalism.

❖ The inability of Marxism to understand the nature of discontent and struggle against capitalism is not only due to the shortcoming of its analysis but also due to the limitation of its method, the **dialectical method.** Foucault's critique of the dialectical method is somewhat similar to that of the Frankfurt School specially Adorno's rejection/critique of the so called 'identity' thinking[18]. What the dialectical method signifies for Foucault is subsumption of the

particular, the concrete under concepts and principles. This has resulted in the neglect and oblivion of details and concrete every day existence. One particular example which Foucault has concentrated on as an example of dialectic's failure is the over emphasis placed by Marxism on state and its consequent inability to grasp how power works and affects the life of people in concerto. Marxism has been unable to develop a proper understanding of how power is exercised in concerto because of the inherent weakness of its method by which every thing has to be subsumed under an abstraction. By this weakness dialectical method becomes akin to French monarchy which "was a discontinuous, rambling, global system with little hold on detail, either exercised over consolidated social groups or else imposing itself only by means of exemplary interventions… Power had only a weak capacity for 'resolution'; as one might say in photographic terms; it was incapable of an individualising exhaustive analysis of the social body. But the economic changes of the eighteenth century made it necessary to ensure the circulation of effects of power through progressively fine channels, giving access to individual themselves, to their bodies, their gestures and all their daily actions". (PK pp. 151-152). This inability to grasp the working of power results in its inability to understand capitalism and to arrive at a correct analysis of capitalism because "(o)ne impoverishes the question of power if one poses it solely in terms of legislation and constitution, in terms solely of the state and the state apparatus. Power is quite different from and more complicated dense and pervasive than a set of laws or a state apparatus. It's impossible to get the development of productive forces characteristic of capitalism if you don't at the same time have the apparatuses of power". (PK p. 158). And if one is unable to understand and grasp these "apparatuses of power" one would end up with an impoverished analysis of capitalism.

❖ The last point I would like to briefly discuses in this context is Foucault's perception of Stalinism as a sort of capitalism. Let me explain this by taking a clue from Foucault's analysis of the relationship between capitalism and liberal regimes (not liberalism as ideology). The development of capitalist forms of power in the west, according to Foucault, is historically linked to the emergence of liberal regimes; "In other political and social systems - the absolutist monarchy, feudalism, etc. - an analogous exercise of power on individuals would not have been possible" (RM p. 167). But the techniques of power, disciplines, apparatuses etc developed in liberal regimes can be generalised in the sense that they can be applied in diverse kinds of regimes: "The growth of a capitalist economy gave rise to the specific modality of disciplinary power whose general formulas, techniques of submitting forces and bodies, in short, 'political anatomy' could be operated in the most diverse political regimes, apparatuses or institutions" (DP p. 229). This is possible because "the technologies of power can be transferred from one field to another during the course of history. There history is **relatively** autonomous with respect to the economic processes that are developed" (RM p. 170). By making this distinction Foucault claims that soviet system under Stalinism had incorporated capitalist techniques capitalist disciplines in such a way that the effects of power and crisis of governance is similar in say capitalist regimes like France, and Sweden and in a Stalinist regime like Poland (ibid. pp. 143-144). Thus without being a capitalist economy the Stalinist soviet order incorporated into its system capitalist governance techniques, institutions, structures in sum capitalist governmental rationality. Hence the same system of subjection as in capitalist countries developed in the Soviet Union under Stalinism and carried on in the subsequent post Stalinist regimes. In this context Foucault develops a whole charge sheet against Stalinist incorportionist strategy. He criticises it for not demolishing the state apparatus and reproducing it as a proletariat state

(PK p. 60). He criticises it for reproducing the state apparatuses in the institution of party and organising it on the same bureaucratic basis which is the hallmark of capitalist governmental rationality. Similarly the exactly same truth and knowledge regimes have developed in both systems, hence there is no essential deference between for example soviet psychiatry and 'western' psychiatry (PPC p. 87). Hence the great capitalist strategy of the 'deployment of sexuality' was applied along the same capitalist lines in Marxist regimes:

> "Two recent events, apparently contradictory: About ten months ago, China launched a campaign against childhood masturbation, along exactly the same lines that defined this campaign in 18th century Europe (masturbation hampers work, causes deafness, brings about the degeneration of the species). On the other hand, before the year is out the Soviet Union will, for the first time, host a congress of psychoanalysts (they have to come from abroad since there are none in Russia). Liberalisation? A thaw on the part of the subconscious? The springtime of the Soviet libido against the moral bourgeoisification of the Chinese? In Peking's archaic stupidities and the quaint Soviet novelties I see mainly a double recognition of the fact that, formulated and prohibited, expressed (**dite**) **and** forbidden (**interdite**) sexuality is a recourse which no modern system of power can do without. We should deeply fear socialism with a sexual physiognomy" (PPC pp. 117-118 emphasis retained).

One can keep on adding such examples. But the crux of that matter is that Soviet and allied regimes in general without being capitalist economies have produced subjectivity, society and state which to all practical purposes are very similar to those of capitalist countries.

Foucault has taken pains to respond to the criticism, which has erupted in the wake of comparison discussed above. He has said that he was "worried by a certain use that is made of the Gulag-internment parallel" (PK p. 134). He has tried to explain why despite similarities in techniques of power there is still a substantive qualitative difference between the totalitarian and democratic regimes. There is a certain contrivance about all such

explanations like his saying that "I have never held that a mechanism of power is sufficient to characterise a society" (RM p. 170). The reason being that though Foucault has alluded to very crucial parallels between the Soviet system and capitalism he has been unable to **explain** exactly what is the **similarity** and what is the **difference** between the two regimes. One reason may be a lack of appropriate terminology. Foucault does not have an articulated conception of difference between **capital** and **capitalism** and that a regime could be dedicated to **capital** without being a capitalist system. Without drawing any parallel here I think the following passage from Meszaros can make clear what Foucault has been trying to explain by the comparison we have been discussing:

> "What is at stake . . . is that the object, the target, of socialist transformation is overcoming the power of capital. Capitalism is a relatively easy object in this enterprise because you can in a sense abolish capitalism through revolutionary upheaval and intervention at the level of politics, the expropriation of the capitalist. You have put an end to capitalism but you have not even touched the power of capital when you have done it. Capital is not dependent on the power of capitalism and this is important also in the sense that capital precedes capitalism by thousands of years. Capital can survive capitalism hopefully not by thousands of years, but when capitalism is overthrown in a limited area, the power of capital continues even if it is in a hybrid form. The Soviet union was not capitalist, not even state capitalist. But the Soviet system was very much dominated by the power of **capital**: the division of labour remained intact, the hierarchical command structure of capital remained. Capital is command system whose mode of functioning is a accumulation-oriented, and the accumulation can be secured in a number of different ways" (Meszaros 1996 p. 54 emphasis retained).

The common link between capitalist countries and the Soviet Union was **capital.** Both regimes were dedicated to capital and that was the reason why it was possible to transfer technologies of power from one system to the other and why they were so similar systems in their rationalities of government, the type of individual they produced and the truth regime that operated within them. A country can be dedicated to capital and can be a totalitarian

regime while another can be dedicated to capital but can be a democratic regime. This is possible because though capital is necessarily a totalising force it is not necessarily a totalitarian force.

2.5 Conclusion

As our analysis above makes it clear Foucault's analysis of capitalism is clearly very different from Marxist analysis. Foucault infers that to overthrow capitalism Foucauldian struggles and not Marxist struggles are required. But what are Foucauldian struggles and how and in what sense do they aim to overthrow capitalism? The answer to this question shall occupy us in the third and final chapter.

III

Foucauldian Struggles

We do not lack communication, on the contrary we have too much of it. We lack creation. We lack resistance to the present.

Deleuze and Guattari[1]

The final word on power is that resistance comes first.

Deleuze Foucault[2]

3.1 Foucault's Theorisation of Struggles in General

Foucault categorises struggles, in general, into three types:

- Struggles against domination
- Struggles against exploitation
- Struggles against subjection

Roughly speaking struggles against domination are struggles against the domination of one group over another on ethnic, social and religious bases. Struggles against exploitation are

struggles against "the separat(ion) (of) individuals from what they produce". And finally struggles against subjection are struggles against "that which ties the individual to himself and submits him to others in this (i.e. a particular) way (struggles against subjection, against forms of subjectivity and submission)" [SP p. 212 comments in first parenthesis mine]. As usual Foucault is not very precise about his terminology and classifications. He quite often uses domination and subjection interchangeably as is the case in the following remarks about disciplinary methods: "(m)any disciplinary methods had long been in existence - in monasteries, armies, workshops. But in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (they) became general formulas of domination" (DP. p. 137). Here domination is used in the sense of subjection.

Hence the difference between domination and subjection is to be made clear. I shall do this by further exploring the different forms of domination that are contrasted by Foucault with subjection. The struggles against subjection are differentiated from struggles against slavery. The struggle against subjection is different from struggle against slavery because it is not struggle against (primarily) a "appropriation of bodies". Struggle against slavery on the other hand is struggle against "appropriation of bodies". Similarly struggle against subjection is not struggle against 'servitude'. 'Servitude' is a "constant, total, massive, non analytical, unlimited relationship of domination established in the form of the individual will of the master, his 'caprice". Struggles against subjection are not struggles against a constant total, massive, non-analytical, unlimited relationship of domination". Similarly struggle against subjection is not a struggle against the individual master or class of masters since struggle against subjection is against the effects of 'anonymous' power. In this sense struggles against subjection are not struggles against vassalage. The relationship of 'vassalage' is defined by

Foucault as "a lightly coded, but distant relation of submission, which (bears) less on the operation of the body than on the products of labour and marks of allegiance". Finally struggles against subjection are to be differentiated from the subjections of 'monastic type'. The purpose of the 'monastic type' of subjection "was to obtain renunciation rather than increase utility". Similarly the 'monastic type' of subjection though it 'involved obedience to others' its primary aim was "the mastery of each individual over his own body" (DP p. 137). Since modern subjection is different from the 'monastic type' of subjection in being aimed at utility maximisation and in being subjection to 'others' through (primarily) self-subjection, struggles against subjection are not struggles against the 'monastic type' of subjection.

Although the above examples are not exhaustive in any sense they are sufficient to clarify what Foucault might mean when he differentiates between 'domination' and 'subjection'. Similarly we can see from these examples that 'subjection' is a kind of domination. Hence every subjection is by definition domination too but not every domination is necessarily a subjection. Foucault differentiates between domination and subjection to **specify** and emphasise the particular kind of domination that has been the hallmark of capitalism and to highlight its **uniqueness** among the flurry of historically existing forms of dominations.

According to Foucault although all three types of struggles can be found coexisting in a society in an era, normally one kind of struggle tends to dominate a particular society. Thus, for example, though in feudal societies struggles against exploitation may be found they are not the characteristic struggles of the feudal era. In this sense Foucault concludes that the struggles characteristic of the feudal era were struggles against domination. Struggles against exploitation were characteristic struggles of the nineteenth century. "And now a days", says

Foucault, "struggle against the forms of subjection - against the submission of subjectivity - is becoming more and more important" (SP. p. 213). We can conclude from Foucault's statement that characteristic struggles of the late/advanced capitalism are struggles against subjection. However, Foucault adds, this is not the first time in the western history that struggles around subjectivity have become prominent and the examples Foucault gives, leave one wondering whether these kinds of struggles are tied to extraordinary times in the life of Western civilisation. Let me quote Foucault on this:

> "I suspect that it is not the first time that our society has been confronted with this kind of struggle. All those movements which took place in the fifteenth and sixteenth century and which had the Reformation as their main expression and result should be analysed as a great crisis of the Western experience of subjectivity and a revolt against the kind of religious and moral power which gave form, during the Middle ages, to this subjectivity. The need to take a direct part in spiritual life, in the work of salvation, in the truth which lies in the Book - all that was a struggle for a new subjectivity" (ibid.)

In a similar fashion characteristic struggles in late/advanced capitalism are struggles against capitalist subjectivity and search for a new (undefinable) subjectivity.

For Foucault struggles are a permanent feature of human societies. This is because of the fact that the quest for freedom is seen a unique indeed defining feature of human being. Human beings by their very 'nature' are compelled to aspire to freedom. And since Foucault has defined freedom as struggle (chapter I) or more precisely struggles as a part and parcel of the structure of freedom, struggles too become a permanent feature of human societies.

As we have seen (chapter I) Foucault presupposes a fundamental ontology, which conceives human beings as animals committed to the project of freedom, the impossible project of deification: "Man is an animal of experience, he is involved **ad infinitum** within a process that, by defining a field of objects, at the same time changes him, deforms him and transfigures him as a subject" (RM p. 124 emphasis retained). This is how human beings have been throughout their history: ". . . in the course of their history, men had never ceased constructing themselves, that is, to shift continuously the level of their subjectivity, to constitute themselves in an infinite and multiple series of different subjectivities that would never reach an end and would never place us in the presence of something that would be 'man' (ibid. pp. 123-124). Now if struggles are a part and parcel of freedom, struggles too would seem to be a constant feature of human societies. We have seen above (chapter II) in detail how freedom can be a means of governance. In that same discussion we had also alluded to the 'intransigence' of freedom and had opined that Foucault considers 'intransigence' too as a basic characteristic of freedom. We can take this 'intransigence' of freedom as implying the possibility of struggle. Thus what Foucault is saying is that although freedom can be a means of governance, the possibility of governance/management in itself imply the possibility of 'intransigence' and hence of struggle against (any) subjectivity. Thus the possibility of struggle is never completely[3] foreclosed.

This is so because a) Human beings by their very 'nature' are freedom seeking animals b) And there is fundamental ambivalence inherent within freedom so that it is the means of governance and intransigence at the same time c) Thus the possibility of freedom/struggle is never foreclosed. As Foucault puts it:

> "There is no question that the appearance in nineteenth-century psychiatry, jurisprudence, and literature of a whole series of discourses on the species and subspecies of homosexuality, inversion, pederasty, and "psychic hermaphrodism" made possible a strong advance of social controls into (the) area of "perversity"; but it also made possible the formation of a "reverse" discourse: homosexuality began to speak in its own behalf, to demand that its legitimacy or "naturality" be acknowledged, often in the same vocabulary, using the same categories by which it was medically disqualified. There is not, on the one side, a discourse of power, and opposite it, another discourse that runs counter to it. Discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; they can, on the contrary, circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy". (HS pp. 101-102).

The emergence of 'reverse' discourse within the same field of power relations was possible because of this double character of freedom. Foucault clearly demonstrates the same phenomenon of discourse-counter discourse, strategy - counter strategy through the example of 'investment' of power in body. While on the one hand power controls the body through "stimulation" (PK p. 57), through increasing the capability through increasing the possibility of diversity, perversions etc (HS pp. 47-48), but on the other hand this same strategy of control is capable of giving rise to and providing the **space** for the revolt of body against the controlling power and controlling strategy. As Foucault puts it:

> "As always with relations of power, one is faced with complex phenomena which don't obey the Hegelian form of the dialectic. Mastery and awareness of one's own body can be acquired only through the effect of an investment of power in the body: gymnastics, exercises, muscle-building, nudism, glorification of the body as beautiful. All of this belongs to the pathway leading to the desire of one's own body, by way of the insistent, persistent, meticulous work of power on the bodies of children or soldiers, the healthy bodies. But once power produces this effect, there inevitably emerge the responding claims and affirmations, those of one's own body against power, of health against the

> economic system, of pleasure against the moral norms of sexuality, marriage, decency. (Suddenly, what had made power strong becomes used to attack it). Power, after investing itself in the body, finds itself exposed to a counterattack in the same body. Do you recall the panic of the institutions of the social body, the doctors and politicians, at the idea of non-legalised cohabitation (**I'union libre**) or free abortion? But the impression that power weakens and vacillates here is in fact mistaken; power can retreat here, re-organise its forces, invest itself elsewhere . . . and so the battle continues" (PK p. 56).

It took the 'genius' of liberal theorists and managers to realise that 'intransigence' is a part of freedom. The possibility of struggle is inherent within freedom. And wherever there has been control, oppression, repression etc there has been struggle against control, oppression and repression. Hence liberal managers realised that "to govern too much is not to govern at all" (op.cit.).

We have already seen (chapter I) that according to Foucault truth relation power relations and self to self relation are the three fundamental relations that constitute the existence of any society. Thus every society has its truth regime, its power regime and its regime of individuation (of which subjectivisation is a particular form). We have also seen (chapter I) that a without domination cannot exist. There can be difference among societies as to the level of domination but there can be no such web of relations that is totally transparent. We can relate this to our discussion (above) about the permanence of struggles in human history and we will reach the conclusion that struggles are the permanent way of relating to a particular power, truth and individualisation (subjectivisation) regime. In Foucault's the new subjectivisation regime western man seeks to create through is not definable.

3.2 Fundamental Structure of Struggles

While the specificity of struggles is defined by the corresponding relation regime its general character and structure is defined by freedom. Struggles are waged **for** freedom. There is **no** other reference point for struggles. The only legitimate universal that Foucault recognises is freedom. As freedom can be divided into positive and Negative freedom so struggles can be categorised into positive and Negative struggles. In what follows I shall discuss these two aspects of the Foucauldian conception of struggles separately.

3.2 (i) Negative Struggles

Negative struggles have their general structure which is defined by the general characteristics of Negative freedom and they have their specificity which is defined by the corresponding relation regime. In what follows I shall discuss the general characteristics of Negative struggles under the following heads.

a) Questioning (problematisation)

b) Limit attitude and transgression

I shall limit myself to the general characteristics of Negative struggles and shall allude to any specificity only when it has any bearing upon these general characteristics.

3.2 (ia) Questioning (Problematisation)

Questioning and permanent questioning is the most important facet of Foucauldian politics. Those who are ruled are entitled to ask how they are being ruled, what are the implications of particular policies for their freedom, well being etc. Permanent questioning is the way to ensure that 'these games are played with minimum domination'. The justification for questioning does not lie in some (utopian) alternative. The one who questions is not questioning because he has necessarily a better alternative, one questions because of one's commitment to the project of freedom, because one is a questioning animal. Thus Foucault argues that he has not questioned modern institutions and practices because he has some definitive alternative, he questions institutions and practices and the state because he thinks we are entitled to ask questions about things that affect our freedom from those who rule us in the name of freedom. "I do not think that in regard to madness and mental illness (for example) there is any politics that can contain the just and definitive solution", Foucault says. On the other hand he argues "that in madness, in derangement, in behaviour problems, there are reasons for questioning politics; and politics must answer these questions, but it never answers them completely" (FR p. 384). The reason for questioning is what is at stake, and that is the freedom of an animal whose 'essence' is freedom. Foucault differentiates between the free speech of those who govern and the free speech of those who are governed. Those who are governed are entitled and they "can and must question those who govern them, in the name of knowledge, the experience they have, by virtue of being citizens, of what those who govern do, of the meaning of their actions, of the decisions they have taken" (PPC pp. 51-52). In this regard Foucault warns against the trap, which is employed by

governors to bar those who are governed by them from asking questions, from questioning their acts:

> ". . . one must avoid a trap in which those who govern try to catch intellectuals and into which they often fall: put yourselves in our place and tell us what you would do. It is not a question one has to answer. To make a decision on some question implies knowledge of evidence that is refused us, an analysis of the situation that we have not been able to make. This is a trap. Nevertheless, as governed, we have a perfect right to ask questions about the truth: what are you doing, for example, when you are hostile to Euromissiles, or when, on the contrary, you support them, when you restructure the Lorraine steel industry, when you open up the question of private education" (ibid. p. 52).

In this sense questioning aims at permanent problematisation of those elements in the present that constitute the present threat to the freedom of the governed.

Two strands of questioning may be discerned in Foucault. On the one hand questioning is the normal way of human beings. If the world is permanently a dangerous place in the sense that every web of relations poses threats to human freedom, no society can be conceived in which the need for questioning disappears. In this sense questioning may be described as a permanent human condition.

On the other hand this general critique must take the form of specific and concrete questioning in the sense that it must be levelled against and directed towards a corresponding power/truth/individuality regime. Finally this questioning is to be directed towards those aspects of the present that are crucial in the context of the realisation or hindrance of freedom.

In this context the purpose of permanent questioning is to problematise the present. Permanent questioning, is refusal to treat existing reality as the permanent arrangement of things: "we must free ourselves from the sacralisation of the social as the only reality and stop regarding as superfluous something so essential as thought. Thought exists independently of systems and structures of discourse. It is something that is often hidden that which always animates everyday behaviour" (PPC pp. 154-155). In this context the purpose of critique is "not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest" (ibid. 155). Through the problematisation of existing reality "one can no longer think things as one formerly thought of them", and "transformation become both very difficult, and quite possible". Thus "the work of deep transformation can only be carried out in a free atmosphere, one constantly agitated by a permanent criticism" (ibid. p. 155). Thus permanent questioning is the condition of the real transformation of a society. It is directed towards the "contemporary limits of the necessary that is, towards what is not or is no longer indispensable for the constitution of ourselves as autonomous subjects" (FR p. 43).

In a sense problematisation is the result of permanent questioning. The problematisation presupposes a certain dissatisfaction with the present, with the present as a whole or with certain elements that constitute the present " . . . for a domain of action, a behaviour, to enter the field of thought, it is necessary for a certain member of factors to have made it uncertain, to have provoked certain member of difficulties around it" (ibid. p. 388). Again such a problematisation is the condition of real transformation in any society.

3.2 (ib) Limit Attitude and Transgression

Limit attitude consist of two components. Taking the present seriously and having an ironical stance towards the present.

Taking the present seriously involves transcending the facile "gesture of rejection" (FR p. 45). The reality can not be wished away. Taking the present seriously involves analysing reality in its specificity. Taking the present seriously involves doing archaeology.

But taking the present seriously does not amount to taking the real as sacred. It is in order to enter into a difficult relation with reality. We take the present seriously in order to transform reality, in order to transgress the tyranny of the present. This is what is meant by taking an ironical stance towards the present. Taking an ironical stance towards the present involves effecting a certain detachment vis a vis reality. It involves bracketing the reality not in the factual sense but in the normative sense: "to stand detached from it, bracketing its familiarity, in order to analyse the theoretical and practical context with which it has been associated". (Foucault 1985 p. 3). Taking an ironical stance towards the present involves doing genealogy.

It would be fruitful to contrast the **limit attitude** to the Kantian enterprise. The Kantian enterprise involved searching for limits. These limits have two characteristics. First, limits are universal. Second it is the demand of rationality and freedom that these limits be adhered to and complied with. This is what Foucault calls the project of "seeking to make possible a metaphysics that has become a science" (FR p. 46). This was the Kantian project. **The limit**

attitude also involves recognising the limits and treating them seriously but the limit attitude does not take these limits as universal and hence it does not aim at complying with these limits but aims at transgressing them. It takes these limits seriously by realising their necessity, but this necessity is historical and hence transcendable. Moreover the project of freedom does not require compliance with these limits (since they are not the limits defined by universal reason) but requires perpetually transgressing them, As Foucault puts it:

> " . . . if the Kantian question was that of knowing what limits knowledge has to renounce transgressing, it seems to me that the critical question today has to be turned back into a positive one: in what is given to us as universal necessary, obligatory, what place is occupied by whatever is singular, contingent, and the product of arbitrary constraints? The point, in brief, is to transform the critique conduced in the form of necessary limitation into a practical critique that takes the form of possible transgression" (ibid. p 45).

In this context the aim of Negative struggles is not to make a scientific metaphysics possible but it "is seeking to give new impetus, as far and wide as possible, to the undefined work of freedom" (ibid. p. 40).

In this sense Negative struggles are the condition of the possibility of Positive struggles in the same way as Negative freedom is the condition of Positive freedom.

3.2 (ii) Positive Struggles

As Negative freedom without Positive freedom is an empty gesture so the Negative struggles without Positive struggles are mere anarchy. Positive struggles are what give 'form' to "our impatience for liberty" (FR p. 50).

Foucault has often been accused of not providing any definitive alternative to capitalism. The objection, is off the mark. The reason being that any **alternative** put in advance would necessarily be limiting vis a vis the field of possibility inherent in the present. Thus according to Foucault **an alternative must evolve through struggles** and should not be specified in advance[4]. The former we can name the thick conception of (the) alternative while the latter as the thin conception. Thus the refusal to put forward any definitive alternative is not accidental it is seen as a necessary entailment of commitment to Foucauldian limitless freedom. Thus we can not look forward to any ready made and definitive alternative due to our commitment to freedom " . . . the question I am trying to ask are not determined by a pre-established political outlook and do not tend toward the realisation of some definite political project" (ibid. p. 375).

The projects that purport to provide definitive alternatives are **totalising, limiting** and **abstract** (ibid.) The alternative projects are **totalising** in that they try to imagine the alternative reality, to be built, as a whole in advance. They are limiting in two senses. First limiting in the sense that they put impossible conditions on action. You have to destroy the

system as a whole first (for example) in order to start doing anything in term of positive action at all. As Foucault puts it:

> " . . . to imagine another system is to extend our participation in the present system . . . this particular idea of 'the whole of society' . . . arose . . . within this highly individualised historical development that culminates in capitalism. We readily believe that the least we can expect of experiences, actions and strategies is that they take into account 'the whole of society' . . . But I believe that this . . . means **imposing impossible conditions on our actions because this notion functions in a manner that prohibits the actualisation, success and perpetuation of these projects. 'The whole society' is precisely that which should not be considered except something to be destroyed"** (Foucault 1977 p. 230 and pp. 232-233 emphasis added).

Second they are limiting in that they limit freedom in the normative sense. They are limiting as they put limitations on our ambit of choice. Foucault's objection here is similar to the one raised by liberals against the notion of Positive freedom as is borne out by the following passage:

> " . . . we know from experience that the claim to escape from the system of contemporary reality so as to produce the overall programs of another society, of another way of thinking, another culture, another vision of the world, has led only, to the return of the most dangerous traditions. . ." (FR p. 46).

This is undeniably an allusion to the authoritarian and totalitarian movements (both fascist and communists) of the twentieth century.

The alternatives are also rejected because they are abstractions. They are abstractions because they are based on the wrong assumptions about the nature of theories and their relation to reality. They wrongly assume that reality is fashioned after theories. On the other

hand according to Foucault reality is constituted through practices (cf. below and Veyne 1997a). The distinction between theory and practice is also abstraction since the distinction itself is based on the wrong notion of the duality of theory and practice. Practices are prior to this distinction. It is from practices and not theory that reality is 'derived'[5]. Theory comes after a reality has been constituted. Otherwise theory would be unrealisable utopia. In both senses theory is **abstraction**.

Thus the concept of the 'whole society' can only be invoked as a negative concept. To invoke it in its positivity would be **totalising**, **limiting** and **abstract**. Thus, the future, the alternative can only be referred to in indefinite unknowable terms as 'other', 'different', etc.

Foucauldian struggles on the other hand never deem anything unquestioned, neither the purported 'we' nor the (if there is any) alternative. The alternative vision is always suggestive, indefinite and experimental and its appeal is only aesthetic. Thus Foucauldian struggles are **opening up,** they open up the choice.

They are **concrete** in the sense that they are practices of freedom and do not just promise freedom in some distant future. They are concrete but **general** too. Struggles and practices are concrete and general when concrete practice can be used in other contexts as well. Let me explain this point by an example from Foucault, how Panoptism was a concrete practice that has general import: "Panoptism . . . had the peculiarity of being utilised first of all on a local level, in schools, barracks and hospitals. This was where the experiment of integral surveillance was carried out . . . . And, at (a) certain moment in time, these methods began to

become generalised" (PK pp. 71-72). Thus a practice that was local became generalised but this generalisation is not abstraction because it is situated in concrete practices.

Out of these concrete, specific and local practices and struggles which neither refer back to any 'we' (in the normative sense) nor to any thick conception of (the) alternative(s) but which are nevertheless generalisable emerges a new reality (which itself is to be transcended subsequently). Thus struggles are situated in the present web of relations and evolve in such a manner that they lead to the establishment of totally different kinds of relationships, a total transformation. This is precisely how Foucault interprets his own endeavour:

> "If . . . I had wanted to write the history of psychiatric institutions in Europe between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, I'd certainly never have written a book like The **History of Madness.** But the problem isn't that of humoring the professional historians. Rather, I aim at having an experience myself-by passing through a determinate historical content-an experience of what we are today, of what is not only our past but also our present. And I invite others to share the experience. **That is, an experience of our modernity that might permit us to emerge from it transformed. Which means that at the conclusion of the book we can establish new relationship with what was at issue;** for instance, madness, its constitution, its history in the modern world" (RM pp. 33-34 emphasis added).

The 'establishment of this new relationship' is elsewhere described as 'a way of dismantling an object, and of constructing a method of analysis toward that end" (ibid. p. 28). This corresponds to dismantling of and transformation of subject. To the constitution of every object corresponds the constitution of subject. Thus through practices and struggles new subjects and new objects are formed. Through the formation of new object and subject new knowledges are formed. This is how Foucault describes for example the process of the

formation of biology. In the process of the formation of biology Foucault contends (referring to Canguilhem) that:

> " . . . it was man himself as a living individual who called himself into question in this experience. By means of the establishment of the biological sciences, man, while establishing a certain kind of knowledge (**savoir**), was also changing himself as a living individual. Owing to the fact that he was able to operate on himself, change his own conditions of life and his life itself, man was constructing a biology that was nothing other than the reciprocal form of the attempt of the life sciences to encompass the general history of the species" (ibid. p. 68).

Practices and struggles are what create and establish new knowledges, new relations, new institutions. These new knowledges are what Foucault calls subjugated knowledges. These knowledges arise out of concrete practices and struggles that defy established ways of saying and doing things: "I believe that what this essentially local character of criticism indicates in reality is an autonomous, non centralised kind of theoretical production, one that is to say whose validity is not dependent on the approval of the established regimes of thought" (PK p. 81).

Foucault's overall idea seems to be that these local knowledges would eventually lead to a new regime of truth, and power and to a new subjectivity. The regime would not be the one in which all relations would become transparent but in which there would be a greater space for diversity of experience, greater space for diversity of saying and doing things. And this would be a never ending process, what Foucault calls permanent struggle (FR p. 42).

The only reference point for the struggles is the existing reality as the context of the struggle and freedom as an ethos, ideal etc, freedom in both senses, of negative and Positive freedom with the proviso that only the thin conception of Positive freedom is being referred to here.

Thus the only context of struggle is the existing reality which is the factual context of struggles. Foucault rejects any normative powers of the existing web of relations. Thus struggles and practice, do not/should not refer back to any unquestioned and unquestionable, 'we' (for example) struggles should not purport to provide any definite alternative. Struggle is a practice that can have general import the reconstitution of present power relations and for the emergence of a new 'we'. Reflecting on Richard Rorty's objection that he does not refer to any 'we' Foucault doubts that at the time when he wrote **MC** there existed any 'we' for that practice to refer to:

> " . . . I'm not sure that at the time when I wrote the history of madness, there was a preexisting and receptive "we" to which I would only have to refer in order to write my book, and of which this book would have been the spontaneous expression. Laing, Cooper, Basaglia, and I had no community, nor any relationship. But the problem posed itself to those who read us, as it also posed itself to some of us, of seeing if it was possible to establish a "we" on the basis of work that had been done, a "we" that would also be likely to form a community of action" (FR p. 385).

The whole point of struggle is dissatisfaction with the existing reality, with the existing 'we'. Thus an existing reality, existing 'we' or any of its historical precursors can not be treated as having any normative power. The "present we" provides only an indispensable factual context.

The only normative context is freedom. Foucauldian struggles are struggle for freedom. But there can be no definite alternative because that would involve a thick conception of freedom which is contrary to freedom. Thus freedom remains a normative context in the sense of unending yearning for 'difference', a permanent loath for the present.

3.3 Foucauldian Struggles

While the general characteristics of struggles is determined by the nature of freedom, by the fact that they are struggles for freedom, the specific characteristics of struggles are determined by the nature of the corresponding relation regime.

As we have seen in detail (chapter II), the fundamental characteristic present capitalist relational regime is subjection and this subjection permeates the whole web of relations in capitalist society. Thus the fundamental characteristic of struggles in such a regime is that they are primarily struggles against subjection and the domination that entails subjection. They are not primarily struggles against exploitation.

The reason for this is not that there does not exist economic exploitation in modern capitalist societies but because here the main form of the exercise of power is no longer economic domination as has been the characteristic form of the exercise of power in early capitalism. Foucauldian struggles reflect the dominant form of the exercise of power in modern capitalist societies and are aimed at it: " . . . nowadays, the struggle against the form of subjection - against the submission of subjectivity - is becoming more and more important,

even though the struggle against form of domination and exploitation have not disappeared" (SP p. 213).

3.3 (i) Struggles and their Nature

Thus Foucauldian struggles are responses to the spread of the subjugating forms of power and the whole regime of relations that sustains the hegemony of capital in the modern world. Foucault on several occasions speaks of the emerging struggles, which are diverse, mostly single issue oriented, but their general import is that they are all struggles against the dominant from of power that reigns in modern capitalist societies and states. Such struggles include "opposition to the power of men over women, of parents over children, of psychiatry over the mentally ill, of medicine over the population, of administration over the ways people live" (SP p. 211).

In what follows I shall endeavour to understand these struggles against subjecting power in terms of struggles against capitalist governmental rationality, capitalist epistemology and capitalist individuality.

3.3 (ia) Struggle against Capitalist Governance

Foucauldian struggles are struggles against capitalist governmental rationality. They question the way people are 'lead' and the 'reasons' on the basis of which they are 'lead' in modern capitalist societies. Foucault defines 'government' as "the set of institutions and practices by which people are 'lead' from administration to education, etc" (RM p. 176). In this sense Foucauldian struggles are struggles against capitalist governmental rationality. They are struggles against capitalist form of governance, which 'lead' people by combining the principle of utility maximisation and 'docility' as the function of government. They are struggles against the form of governance, which demand subjection of people in the name of their salvation in this world. They are struggles against the forms of governance that demand the subjection of population in the name of life enhancement.

Thus Foucauldian struggles are not just struggles against the capitalist state but they are struggles against the rationality upon which the hegemony of the capitalist state rests. And to the extent that this rationality permeates the whole web of relations in capitalist order, struggles against this form of rationality are struggles against capitalist order as such.

Foucault sees the crisis of governance, the widespread delegetimation of capitalist governmental rationality, which form the background of Foucauldian struggles as an event comparable to the crisis of governance, which had led medieval societies to the threshold of modernity. As Foucault puts it:

> "It is (the) set of procedures, techniques, and methods that guarantee the 'government' of people, which seems to me to be in crisis today. This is true for the Western world as well as the socialist world: I think people in both worlds are feeling more and more discomfort, difficulty, impatience with the way they are 'led'. It is a phenomenon that has its effect in daily life and that expresses itself in particular and diffuse forms of resistance, sometimes in revolt over questions that regard, as a matter of fact, daily life, as well as other general choices (take for example the reactions regarding nuclear problems . . .) I think that in the history of West we can identify a period that in some ways resemble our own . . . I' am speaking of the period following the Middle Ages. I mean that from the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries an entire reorganisation of the 'government' of people took place: Protestantism, the development of the great nation states, the formation of the authoritarian monarchies, the administration of territories, the Counter Reformation, all representing a shift in the balance between the Catholic Church and the rest of world. All of these events changed the way of managing and governing people, both in their individual relations and their social and political ones. It seems to me that we are not very far from a similar period today. All relationships are again being questioned . . . We are, I believe, at the beginning of a huge crisis of a wide ranging reevaluation of the problem of 'government" (ibid. pp. 176-177).

This crisis is developing because people are beginning to feel that the power that has organised their individual and social life i.e. the way they are individualised and socialised, has become unbearable and intolerable.

What has become unbearable and intolerable is the form of power that purports to define people's life, individual and social. Capitalist governmental rationality and its access to and its authority over the individual and social life is being challenged. This is happening because the form of power which sustains such a governmental rationality i.e. bio/disciplinary power is increasingly becoming unacceptable and illegitimate in modern capitalist societies. Modern single issue movements and struggles should be seen in this context. They are not just single issue movements but they have general import too and that

general import is that they are (or they have potential to become) struggles against the hegemony of bio/disciplinary power. As Foucault puts it, reflecting on the meaning of his own work and relating it to the contemporary struggles in which it finds its resonance:

> " . . . what was it that had troubled me and determined my existence and my work up until the moment (that is up to May 1968)? And what, on the other hand, was the moving force that guided the youth movement of 68? I wonder, for example, what was the meaning of the serious dissatisfaction that was being expressed and which I had experienced, in Swedish society? **And then, what did the analogous unhappiness in Poland indicate, which was repeatedly witnessed, even though it was recognised on many sides that the condition of material life were no worse than at other times?** . . . What was it that was being questioned everywhere? I think my answer is that the **dissatisfaction came from the way in which a kind of permanent oppression in daily life was being put into effect by the state or by other institutions and oppressive groups. That which was ill tolerated and continuously questioned was 'power'. And not only state power, but also that which was exercised within the social body through extremely different channel, forms, and institutions. It was no longer acceptable to be 'governed' in a certain way** I mean "governed" in an extended sense; I'm not referring just to the government of the state and the men who represent it, but also to those man who organise our daily lives by means of rules, by way of direct or indirect influences, as for instance the mass media" (ibid. pp. 143-145 emphasis added).

According to Foucault to many it is no longer acceptable to be governed according to capitalist governmental rationality. Thus Foucauldian struggles are struggles against capitalist governmental rationality.

So much for the negative aspect of struggles, what is their positive import in this context? Though the limitation of the 'thin alternative' does not allow one to stretch the imagination much two things can still be said. One is general the other is relatively specific.

On the general plane it can be said that Foucauldian struggles aspire to a form of governmental rationality in which the inevitable game of power can be played with minimising domination (PPC p. 88).

On the more specific plane it can be said that there can be no room for the state in the modern capitalist sense of the term in any alternative arrangement that Foucauldian struggles might evolve into. The reason is that it is the notion of the modern state as an all pervasive rationality which interlinks the state in the narrow sense, with the society and the individual and through this increases the ambit of the state in the narrow administrational sense over the whole of life. There would be no place for state in this sense in any arrangement evolevable through the Foucauldian struggles (see PK pp. 59-61). It is in this sense that Foucauldian struggles "are anarchistic struggles" (SP p. 211)[6].

3.3 (ib) Struggle against Capitalist Epistemology

We have seen in detail (chapter II) that capitalist governance is not possible without the domination of the capitalist truth regime. Management through freedom is possible because freedom is ultimately linked to a particular truth and rationality (cf. Chapter II). Management through freedom is impossible without this ultimate linkage between freedom, truth and government, the purpose of which is to particularise/define/limit freedom.

Foucault's overall analysis is that with the domination of bio power a necessary link was established between rationality, knowledge, truth and performance of freedom and exercise

of choice. And this same connection is what gives the truth regime and its experts (i.e. masters of truth) their normative power. Foucauldian struggles aim at rigorously separating knowledge rationality and truth from the questions of choice and freedom.

According to Foucault there is no analytical link between the practice of freedom and truth and knowledge. The legitimate role of experts is as people who provide the necessary analysis, information, knowledge that is required for making choices, but it is not their role and should not be their role to tell people what choices to make. People should make their own choices. When people start thinking that the role of experts is not only to provide advice in the field of technology the expert has mastered but also of telling what they should be doing, the space for freedom and choice is foreclosed. Through establishing analytical links between truth, and freedom, knowledge and choice bio power forecloses the space of freedom. It is one of the prime targets of Foucauldian struggles to unravel this link between knowledge and freedom. As Foucault puts it:

> "We live in a social universe in which the formation, circulation, and utilisation of knowledge present a fundamental question. If the accumulation of capital has been an essential feature of our society, the accumulation of knowledge has not been any less so. Now, the exercise, production and accumulation of this knowledge cannot be dissociated from the mechanisms of power; complex relations exist which must be analysed. From the sixteenth century on it has always been considered that the development of the forms and contents of knowledge was one of the greatest guarantees of the liberation of humanity. It is a postulate of our Western civilisation that has acquired a universal character, accepted more or less by everyone. It is a fact, however -I was not the first to ascertain this- that formation of great systems of knowledge has also had effects and functions of subjection and rule. This leads us to re examine more or less entirely the postulate according to which the development of knowledge is undoubtedly the guarantee of liberation" (RM pp. 165-166).

Capitalism inherited the notion and image of truth like the concept of salvation, from Christianity. In Christianity truth was considered divine and transparent. Capitalism radically transformed this conception, and radically transformed the concept of salvation to suits its needs. But it found it useful to retain the semi divine and transparent character of truth. This is the function of theories like transcendental idealism, natural law and scienticism. They on the one hand confer a semi divine characteristics and charisma of the Christian monk on the modern masters of truth, on the other hand these theories mask the instrumental character of truth through which truth production is organically linked to capitalist power, the dual power of utility-docility production. Foucauldian struggles against the capitalist truth regime should be seen in this context. Foucauldian struggles are:

> " . . . an opposition to the effects of power which are linked with knowledge, competence, and qualification: struggles against the privileges of knowledge . . . they are also an apposition against secrecy, deformation, and mystifying representations imposed on people.
>
> There is nothing "scientistic" in this (that is, a dogmatic belief in the value of scientific knowledge) but neither is it a sceptical or relativistic refusal of all verified truth. What (these struggles question) is the way in which knowledge circulates and functions, its relation to power. In short, the **regime du savoir**". (SP p. 212).

a) Thus the Foucauldian struggles are against the divination of truth. They assert that truth is "thing of this world". Following Nietzsche they assert that "it was born in altogether "reasonable" fashion - from chance; devotion to truth and the precision of scientific method arose from the passion of scholars, their reciprocal hatred, their fanatical and unending

discussions, and their sprit of competition . . .." (FR p. 78). The struggles aim to show the lowly origin of truth. They are struggles for the de divination of truth.

b) They are struggles against the 'divine' powers of the masters of truth, against their authority to tell what one should do and what one should not do. This can further be explicated by considering the 'new' relation between the intellectuals and non intellectuals that Foucauldian struggles aim to establish and at the redefinition of the role of the intellectual in the political struggle which ends up by calling for a new kind of intellectual, the so called specific intellectual. As Foucault says "It (is) the question of reaching a new kind of collaboration between 'intellectuals' and 'non intellectuals' that would be completely different from that of past" (RM p. 142). The specific intellectual is the one who rigorously separate his position as an intellectual and his position as a citizen (aspirer to freedom). As an intellectual he provides information, analysis etc but from this there does not follow an advice for people as to what they should do and what they should not do. It is left to people to make political and moral choice. As far as making of choice is concerned there is no difference between the status of people and that of the intellectual. This is because there is no analytical link between knowledge, expertise and moral and political choice. As Foucault puts it:

> " . . . for reasons that essentially pertain to my political choice, in the widest sense of the term, I absolutely will not play the part of one who prescribes solutions. I hold that the role of the intellectual today is not that of establishing laws or proposing solution or prophesying, since by doing that one can only contribute to the functioning of a determinate situation of power that to my mind must be criticised. The problems that I try to address, these perplexities of crime, madness, and sex which involve daily life, cannot be easily resolved. It takes years, decades of work carried out at the

> grassroots level with the people directly involved; and the right to speech and political imagination must be returned to them. Then perhaps a state of things may be renewed, whereas in the terms by which it is being posed today, it could only lead to a dead end. I carefully guard against making the law. Rather, I concern myself with determining problems, unleashing them, revealing them within the framework of such complexity as to shut the mouths of prophets and legislators: all those who speak **for** others and **above** others . . . it is necessary to do away with spokespersons" (ibid. pp. 159-160 emphasis retained).

The purpose is to take away the responsibility of choice from specialists and assign it to the people. It is not the business of specialists and should not be their business to tell people what to do what to choose and what not to choose. The people must choose: "People have to build their own ethics, taking as a point of departure the historical analysis, sociological analysis and so on one can provide for them . . . All (the) prescriptive network has to be elaborated and transformed by people themselves" (PPC p. 16). Again "I do not wish, as an intellectual, to play the moralist or prophet . . . The masses have come of age, politically and morally. They are the one who've got to choose individually and collectively. What counts is saying how certain regime functions, in what it consists, so as to prevent an entire series of manipulations and mystifications. But the masses have to make the choice" (RM p. 172).

Thus Foucauldian struggles are struggles for the de-divinisation of the "masters of truth" corresponding to the de-divinisation of truth itself. The intellectuals are also of this world.

c) Foucauldian struggles are struggles against mystification of truth through which it is portrayed as transparent, standing outside power relations etc. The struggles emphasise that truth relation is itself a power relation in the sense that the truth is produced inside a truth regime and the truth produced in turn strengthens the regime which produces it. Thus it is not

sufficient for revolution to change the consciousness of people, what is required is the transformation of the truth regime which is inherently a capitalist truth regime. As Foucault puts it:

> "The essential political problem for the intellectual is not to criticise the ideological contents supposedly linked to science . . . but that of ascertaining the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth. The problem is not changing people's consciousness - or what's in their heads - but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth.
>
> It's not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power (which would be chimera, for truth is already power), but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic, and cultural, within which it operates at the present time" (FR pp. 74-75).

Thus the struggles are on the one hand aimed at overcoming the perpetuated illusion of transparency while on the other hand they question the link of the present truth regime to the capitalist power regime so as to deconstruct the organic link between the truth regime and the power which aims through it to maximise utility and docility.

The positive content of these struggles is to arrive at a new relationship between truth and power i.e. to arrive at a new truth regime such that in it the possibility of diversity is more than the present regime and the imposition of singularity is not as totalising as in the capitalist truth regime. The new regime can not be specified in advance as it will evolve through struggles, practices as the previous regime was evolved through concrete practices. Foucault saw in the insurrection of what he calls subjugated knowledge the signs of the emergence of such a new regime.

Subjugated knowledges have two aspects. First they consist of "the historical contents that have been buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systematisation . . . Subjugated knowledges are thus those blocs of historical knowledge which were present but disguised within the body of functionalist and systematising theory and which criticism . . . has been able to reveal" (PK pp. 81-82). The second component of these knowledges is constituted by "a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity" (ibid. p. 82). These two kinds of knowledges are emerging from the struggles and now form the backbone of Foucauldian struggles. These two types of knowledges obviously involve the labour of intellectuals but these intellectuals are the intellectuals who put their expertise in the service of struggles without imposing their choice on people. These sort of specific intellectuals work closely with the people and are themselves involved in struggles in their capacity of citizens (as a part of the people): "What we have to present are instruments and tools that people might find useful. By forming groups specifically to make these analyses to wage these struggles, by using these struggles by using these instruments or others: this is how, in the end, possibilities open up" (PPC p. 197). But there is no room for the old type of intellectual, the so called universal intellectuals because "if intellectual(s) start playing once again the role (they) had played for a hundred and fifty years - that of prophet, in relation to what 'must be' to what 'must take place' . . . effects of domination will return and we shall have other ideologies, functioning in the same way" (ibid.).

3.3 (ic) Struggle against Capitalist Subjectivity

The last aspect of these struggles is that they are struggles against what Foucault calls 'government of individuation', against a certain sort of subjectification, the way individuals are made subjects in modern capitalist societies. They are struggles against certain self identification, against the notion of identity. Since the notion of identity is what imposes singularity on diversity in the capitalist system, these are struggles that "assert the right to be different and they underlie everything which makes individuals truly individual" (SP p. 211). Thus these are struggles, which demand the legitimacy for and assert the right of polymorphous experiences and infinite and numerous ways of being individual. To obstruct this is to obstruct the freedom of human being, men's right to be different. Essentially they are struggles against the notion of true scientific identity, true self etc; against the notion that there is a true self and that we conform to that true self. This is the notion, which ties us to our own identity and forecloses our search to be different. Thus it imposes abstraction and generality on the individuals and obstructs the realisation of infinite possibilities of being individual, of being ourselves: " . . . all these struggles revolve around the question: Who are we? They are refusal of these abstractions, of economic and ideological state violence which ignores who we are individually, and also a refusal of a scientific or administrative inquisition which determines who one is" (ibid. p. 212). They are a refusal to accept any identity that ties the individual to a particular truth of self in such a way so as to foreclose the possibility of diverse forms of identity and hence different forms of being individual. On the

other hand the same notion of identity separates individuals from individuals by excluding those who do not conform to their true identity. The struggles are a refusal to subjugate to this blackmail any more and to assert "that the problem is not to recover our 'lost' identity, to free our imprisoned nature, our deepest truth; but instead, the problem is to move towards something radically Other" (RM p. 121).

There is no question of going back to a lost identity, to the true identity because there is no lost identity to go back to, there is no deeper truth to decipher except this truth that there is no true identity, there is no deep truth except the identity that we create ourselves and keep creating. Foucault makes clear this point referring to "Marx's phrase: man produces man": "For me, what must be produced is not man identical to himself, exactly as nature would have designed him or according to his essence; on the contrary, we must produce something that doesn't yet exist and about which we cannot know how and what it will be . . . it is a question rather of the destruction of what we are, of the creation of something entirely different, of a total innovation" (ibid. pp. 121-122).

Thus as with the other aspects of struggles these aspects also aim at curtailing the individual's right to diversity of experience is curtailed even if it in the name of and through mechanisms of diversity and incitements and not primarily through repression or prohibition. As Foucault puts it:

> ". . . target nowadays is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get rid of (the) kind of political 'double bind', which is the simultaneous individualisation and totalisation of modern power structures.

> The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state, and from the state's institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualisation which is linked to the state. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of (the) kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries" (SP p. 216).

The tying of the individual to his own identity on the one hand individualises him by separating him from infinite other possibilities of being. It also separates him from his fellow beings by dividing individuals according to their conformity and deviance from their 'true' identity. Through this, subjectivising experiences and individuations are divided into 'normal' and 'abnormal', what Foucault calls dividing practices through which people are separated on the basis of conformity or deviance from the norm. Thus struggles are not only against certain ways of individuations but also against separating individuals from individuals. The Foucauldian struggles "attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces individual back on himself and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way" (SP pp. 211-212). Historically Foucault sees dividing practices as the prime tactic of the bourgeoisie to curtail and manage and conquer the forces of people struggling against them. Thus (for example) "the penal system has had the function of introducing a certain number of contradictions namely the following: to create mutual antagonism between the proletarianised common people and the non-proletarianised common people" (PK p. 14). These dividing practices were specifically aimed at the most 'dangerous' elements among the people. Thus the 'penal system was aimed' (for example);

> " . . . very specifically, against the most mobile, the most excitable, the 'violent' elements among the common people: those who were most prepared to turn to direct, armed action, including farmers who were forced by debts to leave their land, peasants on the run from tax authorities, workers banished

> for theft, vagabonds or beggars who refused to clear the ditches, those who lived by plundering the fields, the small-time thieves and the highwaymen, those who, in armed groups, attacked the tax authorities and, more generally, agents of the State, and finally those who - on days of rioting in the towns or in the villages - carried weapons. There was widespread plotting, a whole network of communications, within which individuals could adopt different roles. It was these 'dangerous' people who had to be isolated (in prison, in the Hopital General, in the galleys, in the colonies) so that they could not act as a spearhead for popular resistance . . . to make the proletariat see the non proletarianised people as marginal, dangerous, immoral, a menace to society as a whole, the dregs of the population, trash, the 'mob'. For the bourgeoisie it is a matter of imposing on the proletariat, by means of penal legislation, of prison, but also of newspapers, of 'literature', certain allegedly universal moral categories which function as an ideological barrier between them and the non proletarianised people" (ibid. p. 15).

It is necessary to abolish the basis of these tactics which divide people from people, not just institutions that sustain them but the power relations and the forms of power the truth regimes that sustain them. The mainstay of this form of power is the notion of identity, true self that is used not only to create individualities that are manageable but to rigorously separate them from those who are not manageable and castigate them as abnormals. This is what must be resisted, and the institutions that support it must be overthrown and the power relations that sustain it must be reconstituted and reconfigured and redefined; " . . . revolution can only take place via the radical elimination of the judicial apparatus, and anything which could reintroduce the penal apparatus, anything which could reintroduce its ideology and enable this ideology to surreptitiously creep back into popular practices, must be banished. This is why the court, an exemplary form of this judicial system, seems to me to be a possible location for the reintroduction of the ideology of the penal system into popular practice. This is why I think that one should not make use of such a model" (ibid. p. 16).

Foucauldian struggles however are also struggles, which seek 'solidarity' and 'communality' going beyond the dividing practices of normal and abnormal. A 'communality' that does not segregate people according to their moral choices, their sexual inclinations, a communality that provides the space for flourishing of 'dangerous' experiences and 'dangerous' subjectivities. It was Foucault's hope that the struggles would lead to a new kind of socialisation, a socialisation which is not based on separation of individual from individuals and which is grounded not in some universal rationality but in concrete practices: "if scientific socialism emerged from the **utopias** of the nineteenth century," opined Foucault, "it is possible that a real socialisation will emerge in the twentieth century form **experiences**" (Foucault 1977 p. 231 emphasis retained).

Foucauldian struggles also aim at deconstructing the link between the increase in individual's capabilities and the simultaneous increase in his subjection (primarily through self-domination). There are struggles to deconstruct the organic link between the process of the maximisation in the utility of the individual and the process of the maximisation in docility of the individual. As Foucault puts it:

> "We know that great promise of the great hope of the eighteenth century, or a part of the eighteenth century lay in the simultaneous and proportional growth of individuals with respect to one another. And, moreover, we can see that throughout the entire history of Western societies (it is perhaps here that the root of their singular historical destiny is located-such a peculiar destiny, so different from the others in its trajectory and so universalising, so dominant with respect to the others), the acquisition of capabilities and the struggle for freedom have constituted permanent elements. Now the relation between the growth of capabilities and the growth of autonomy are not as simple as the eighteenth century may have believed. And we have been able to see what forms of power relation were conveyed by various technologies (whether we are speaking of productions with economic aims, or

> institutions whose goal is social regulation, or of techniques or communication): disciplines both collective and individual, procedures of normalisation exercised in the name of the power of the state, demands of society or of population zones, are examples. What is at stake, then, is this: How can the growth of capabilities be disconnected from the intensification of power relations?" (FR pp. 47-48).

To sum up. Foucauldian struggles are struggles against the bio/disciplinary form of powers that underlie modern capitalist practices and institutions and discourses and against the sort of politics of truth that sustain these and the subjectivity that is the product of this politics and these power games. These struggles on the other hand are also Positive struggles to constitute relations that are based on a new sort of power, on a new politics of truth that can lead to the formation of a new sort of subjectivity. Although Foucault refuses to pinpoint the specific **nature** of these new relations, due to reasons, I hope, sufficiently made clear during our discussion, we know their general aim which is to provide more room for diversity of experiences and diversity of the different forms of individualities, without the reimposition of singularity.

3.4 The Possibility of System Wide Resistance

If the system of accumulation is conditioned on the production and reproduction of a particular truth, subjectivity and power regime (as Foucault thinks it is), and if the Foucauldian struggles aim at overcoming and deconstructing the relational regime which is the condition of accumulation in general (as we have shown they clearly do)[7], then we can conclude that at least in theory Foucauldian struggles can pose system wide threat to capitalism and can form the basis of system wide resistance to capitalism[8]. At least this is how Foucault sees struggles to be, as we have tried in show in this study.

I would like to supplement the above conclusion by noting the following three points:

a) First the personal itinerary of Foucault. Foucault always considered his life as committed to the project of transforming and overcoming the bourgeois order. At least this is how he situates his youth days aspirations:

> "For me, politics was essentially a way of testing how much I was maturing in my theoretical reflections. An opportunity to have an experience a la Nietzsche or Bataille. For anyone who was twenty right after the World War, for anyone who had endured rather than participated in that tragedy, what on earth could politics represent when it was a matter of choosing between the America of Truman or the U.S.S.R. of Stalin? Or between the old French S.F.I.O. and the Christian Democrats, etc.? Many young intellectuals, including myself, judged that it would be intolerable to have a "bourgeois" professional future as a professor, journalist, writer, or whatever. The very experience of the war had shown us the necessity and the urgency of creating a society radically different from the one in which we had lived: a society that had accepted nazism, had prostituted itself before it, and then had come out of it **en masse** with De Gualle. In the light of all that many young people in France had the reaction of total rejection. One not only wanted a different world and different society, one also wanted to go deeper, to transform oneself and to revolutionise relationships to be completely "other". (RM pp. 47-48).

The same passion for revolution recurs in Foucault's Algerian experience. Foucault has termed the (Algerian) experience as decisive for him (ibid. p. 132). What was the experience? Let Foucault speak for himself.

> "During (the Algerian) upheavals I was profoundly struck and amazed by those young men and women who exposed themselves to serious risks for the simple fact of having written or distributed a

> leaflet, or for having incited others to go on strike. Such actions were enough to place at risk one's life, one's freedom, and one's body. And this made a very strong impression on me: for me it was a true political experience". (RM p. 134).

Foucault's fascination with the phenomenon of revolution finds its classical expression in his stance towards the Iranian Revolution. What fascinated Foucault about the Iranian Revolution was the fact that it demonstrated the possibility of revolution in a world, which was totally pessimistic about revolution. Thus he terms the Iranian Revolution as "spirit of (a) world without spirit" (PPC p. 215). The Iranian Revolution did not only show the possibility of transformation, it showed the possibility of transformation at the profoundest level. Foucault imagines the Iranian revolutionaries as saying:

> "Of course, we have to change this regime and get rid of this man, we have to change this corrupt administration, we have to change the whole country, the political organisation the economic system, the foreign policy. But, above all, we have to change ourselves. Our way of being, our relationship with others, with things, with eternity, with God, etc, must be completely changed and there will only be a true revolution if this radical change in our experience takes place" (ibid. pp. 217-218).

This of course is the complete Foucauldianisation of the Iranian revolution and tells as almost nothing about the Iranian revolution but much about Foucault.

b) Although Foucauldian struggles are immediate, specific and concrete this does not mean that they do not have general import. As we have already seen concrete manifestations of power like panoptic power were initially developed in a quite localised manner and in a specific form and were then employed to various kinds of contexts at different levels. In a similar fashion the Foucauldian struggles are capable of evolving into a general regime

different than and less dominating than the current capitalist regime. Out of these diverse struggle a new regime of power, and truth may evolve which will be able to sustain greater room for diversity of experiences and hence diversity of subjectivities. Foucault was quite disappointed when he did not see any new generalised forms emerging from these struggles. Foucault explains this in reference to the struggles in France: "The struggle around the prisons, the penal system and the police judicial system, because it has developed in solitary, among social workers and ex prisoners, has tended increasingly to separate itself from the forces which would have enabled it to grow. It has allowed itself to be penetrated by a whole naïve, archaic ideology which makes the criminal at once into the innocent victim and pure rebel - society's scapegoat - and the young wolf of future revolutions. This return to anarchist themes of the late nineteenth century was possible only because of a failure of integration of current strategies. And the result has been a deep split between this campaign with its monotonous, lyrical little chant, heard only among a few small groups, and the masses who have good reason not to accept it as valid political currency, but who also - thanks to the studiously cultivated fear of criminals - tolerate the maintenance, or rather the reinforcement, of the judicial and police apparatus" (FR p. 72). Thus immediacy and concreteness does not deny the need of integrating strategy and need for generalisation. No where in Foucault immediacy and concreteness stand in contrary relation to generality. Similarly Foucauldian movements can not be dubbed as necessarily non revolutionary movements simply because they are single issue movement. At least as far as Foucault's own vision is concerned, as mentioned above, he certainly thought and hoped that they have the potential to evolve into a revolutionary movement.

c) Foucault's revolutionary credentials have been obscured by his peculiar vision of how revolutions occur. Foucault defines revolution as a 'different type of codification of the same relations". Foucault elaborates the implications of this by adding that "there are as many different kinds of revolution . . . as there are possible subversive recodification(s) of power relations" (ibid. p. 64). Three types of relations, which constitute the Foucauldian ontology are the ethical relation, the power relation and the knowledge/truth relation (chapter 1). Revolution is a particular codification of these relations. The total transformation from one system of codification to another, according to this version is necessarily a revolutionary process.

How do revolutions occur in history? According to Foucault over a period of time the existing relational regime becomes intolerable and is increasingly questioned. A new set of relationships start emerging out of practices that are aimed against the existing regime, alongside the existing regime. Out of these practices new relationships, new institutions, new power centres start emerging alongside the existing relations, institutions and power centres. The emerging relational regime keeps eroding the existing one while strengthening itself up to the point where the existing relational regime becomes untenable and collapses and is replaced by the regime which was developing alongside the existing regime.

According to this vision a revolution is the combination of process and event. The development of a new relational regime alongside the existing one over a period of time from concrete and diverse practices is a process while the act of eventual replacement of an existing regime with the one developed alongside and in opposition to it is an event. Revolution is the combination of both. Foucault referring to Furet's book on the French

revolution emphasises the distinction between revolution as process and revolution as an event in understanding any revolution.

> "He (Furet) draws a distinction between the totality of the process of economic and social transformation that began well before the revolution of 1789 and ended well after it, and the specificity of the Revolutionary event". (PPC p. 214).

On the basis of the above discussion, we can arrive at a quite different understanding of Foucault's so called reformism. Thus when Foucault says that "the overthrow of (the) micro powers does not obey the law of all or nothing" (DP p. 27), it is not because of any anti revolutionary reformism but due to his understanding of the nature of the revolutionary dynamics itself.

The above can be explicated further by mentioning that Foucault differentiates between two types of reformism. One type of reformism, which is incompatible with the politics of transformation and polities of revolution is rejected outright: "A transformation that remains within the same mode of thought, a transformation that is only a way of adjusting the same thought more closely to reality of things can merely be a superficial transformation" (PPC p. 156). On the other hand there is a type of transformation which is not a total transformation but which is compatible with and oriented to the struggle for total transformation. This type of reform has a definite place in revolutionary politics. In the following crucial passage where Foucault speaks of the role of the intellectual in revolution, this relationship between reform and transformation becomes very clear. The role of the intellectual Foucault says;

> "is to see how far the liberation of thought can make (the) transformations urgent enough for people to want to carry them out and difficult enough to carry out for them to be profoundly rooted in reality. It is a question of making conflict more visible, of making them more essential than mere confrontations of interests or mere institutional immobility. Out of these conflicts, these confrontations, **a new power relations must emerge, whose first, temporary expression will be a reform**. If at the base there has not been the work of thought upon itself and if, in fact, modes of thought, that is to say modes of action have not been altered, whatever the project for reform, we know that it will be swamped, digested by modes of behaviour, and institutions that will always be the same" (ibid. pp. 155-156 emphasis added).

Thus the revolution remains the aim of Foucault, which amounts to the reconstitutions of present relation regime and emergence of new set of relations and institutionalisation. Of course the new regime itself is never permanent and would be transcended/would need to be transcended soon. Hence the notion of permanent struggles and pessimistic hyper activism.

Viewed from this angle Foucault is certainly a revolutionary as he wants to reconstitute the existing power relations in such a manner that will make according to Foucault the functioning of capitalist state (in the broader sense) impossible and would give rise to new ways of governing that are not as dominating as is the case in bio power regimes and would provide the conditions for the emergence and dispersion of new subjectivities that allow greater diversity of experiences. The mere fact that Foucault does not institute a political party, does not propose programme and definitive utopia, does not necessarily make Foucault a post revolutionary or Foucauldian struggles 'reform' movements.

Foucault aims at more profound and subtler changes in modern regimes than is normally thought and the mere fact that the issues raised in his wake and struggles waged in his name

did not rise to the level of the profundity he had expected of them does not relegate him by itself to the level of post revolutionary.

3.5 Conclusion

We have argued for the following propositions in this study:

❖ First that Foucault is committed to a modified Kantian notion of freedom. His amendments, additions on this are guided by Kantian concerns too. In this context it is misleading to argue that (and Foucault himself is guilty of this) Foucault does not (and can not) refer to any universal. Foucault's universal is freedom. This situates Foucault in the midst of Enlightenment movement and Foucault is committed to the West's revolt against submission to God's Will.

❖ Foucault believed that though capitalism can not prosper without the spread of freedom it also needs to limit the exercise of freedom. He sees capitalism as thwarting the possibility of diversity. He seeks to transcend capitalism for the sake of diversity.

❖ Foucault sees the overcoming of limitation as being sought in a never ending permanent struggle for freedom. In this sense Foucault sees the struggle for freedom as a struggle for the impossible. But as a faithful child of Enlightenment he remains committed to this struggle. In this context we have argued in this study that as struggles for freedom Foucauldian struggles are seen by and conceptualised by Foucault as struggles that (may) pose system wide resistance to capitalism.

❖ There have been two very significant self imposed restrictions of our study:

This has been strictly a study and interpretation of Foucault's self understanding of these struggles. What we have done in this context is to explicate and fill the missing links to form a coherent story without denying the possibility and legitimacy of other stories.

The second limitation of this study is that it takes on face value several of Foucault's assumptions, for example the assumption that there are and can be concrete forms of freedom other than capital and the assumption that Positive struggles can converge to pose a systematic threat to capitalism without posing an anti capital singularity.

There are bases for challenging such assumptions, however that would be an altogether different story.

Notes on Chapter I

[1] Arendt 1961 p. 146.

[2] FR p. 50.

[3] FR p. 46.

[4] see for example Beiser 1987 and Taylor 1975, Arshad 1999, Bashker 1991.

[5] In the Western discourse since the eighteenth century all controversies concern the meaning of freedom and the extant to which it is realised or realisable but nowhere is freedom and its legitimacy as moral and political ideal contested (cf. Paterson 1991).

[6] By 'expediency' we may construe a moral and political theory not based on immutable eternal principles which holds true and define situation in different contexts but on decisions that are best suited to achieve the ends desired by the concerned political community.

[7] cf. PPC pp. 86-95.

[8] On Desecrates see Descartes 1965, Cottingham 1986, Copelston 1955, William 1978.

[9] On Luther see Tawny 1959.

[10] A distinction can be made between a liberal regime as historical entity and liberal ideals. Here we are concerned only with the latter. The same holds true for communitarians.

[11] A person who accepts surrender (normative) may also seek to overcome physical bondage (unless this is a way to surrender).

[12] The main distinction between liberals and communitarians is that liberals define Negative freedom with reference to individual where as communitarians do so in reference to a larger self, a community or a race or a nation or humanity at large. The freedom of communitarians might be unfreedom and heteronomy for liberals.

[13] By complete 'indeterminacy' we mean indeterminacy in both factual and moral sense.

[14] Philosophies of Nietzsche, Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Foucault and Derrida are witness to this trend which culminates in such movements and fads as Postmodernism, Poststructuralism etc.

[15] It would seem, according to this interpretation, that for Foucault freedom is closely linked to fluidity and motion (process). That's why order, institutions, fixed categorisation and discourse are antithesis of freedom. A protean being and a protean self seems the only way to practice freedom, the fluidity through and through that avoids all categorisations, and all delimitations. "I think I have in fact been situated in most of the squares on the political checkerboard, one after another and sometimes simultaneously: as anarchist, leftist, ostentatious or disguised Marxist, nihilist, explicit or secret anti Marxist, technocrat in the service of Gaulism, new liberal, etc. An American professor complained that a crypto Marxist like me was invited to the USA, and I was denounced by the press in Eastern European countries for being an accomplice of the dissidents. None of these descriptions is important by itself; taken together, on the other hand they mean something. And I must admit that I rather like what they mean" (FR pp. 383-384).

[16] Revolution in Foucault is transformation and reconstitution of relationships, cf. FR p. 64 and PPC pp. 211-224.

[17] "Stated broadly, the repressive hypothesis holds that through European history we have moved from a period of relative openness about our bodies and our speech to an ever increasing repression and hypocrisy" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1983 p. 128). Also consider the following: "For a long time many people imagined that the strictness of the sexual codes, in the form that we know them, was indispensable to so-called "capitalist" societies. Yet the lifting of the codes and the dislocation of prohibitions have probably been carried out more easily then people thought they would (which indicates that their purpose was not what it was believed to be) . . .. In sum, people were wrong when they believed that all morality resided in prohibitions and that the lifting of these prohibitions in itself solved the question of ethics" (PPC pp. 262-263).

[18] On Foucault's conception of power see SP pp. 216-226 and HS pp. 92-102 and passim.

[19] My interpretation of Foucault here is indebted to Veyne 1997a.

[20] or more precisely ‘subjectivity’ cf. PPC p. 253.

[21] 'Zero sum conception of power' may be defined as a conception which defines power as complete determination and consequently sees freedom as absence of power. In this case you are either free or determined there is no third way out. Here 'power' is seen as a 'pure limit put on freedom' (HS p. 86).

[22] comments within parenthesis mine.

[23] Foucault’s ‘criterion’ to differentiate what is morally acceptable from what is not is ‘personal experience’ (RM pp. 37-39). Also relevant here is the following passage which have been read, as erroneously I think, as implying Foucault’s fleeing away from social and political straggle to the ‘ivory tower’ of the so called self culture: "For centuries we have been convinced that between our ethics, our personal ethics, our everyday life, and the great political and social and economics structures there were analytical relations, and that we could not change any anything for instance, in our sex life or our family life, without ruining our economy, our democracy and so on. I think we have to get rid of this idea of an analytic or necessary link between ethics and other social or economic or political structures" (FR p. 350).

[24] Knowledge relationship is the relationship between the knowing subject (self) and object.
[25] Power relation is relation between self and other.

[26] Ethical relation is a relation between self and self, the 'relation with one self' (FR p. 8).

[27] for liberal critique of general notions of Positive freedom see Berlin 1559.

[28] The material from now on to the end of this chapter draws on my MA continental philosophy dissertation at University of Warwick, Coventry U.K.

[29] Thus creating new relation regime which was freedom strangulating.

[30] The notion of morality is based on the notion of obligation as moral compulsion for every body in all manageable circumstances and it also provides the means through which singularity is imposed on diversity. It is also a device which connect different compartments of an individual's life and different strata of a society under the same umbrella of morality.

[31] Kant Critique of pure Reason, cited in the text according to the now standard procedure of referring to first edition (A) and the second edition (B) followed by page numbers.

[32] This is Foucault's reinterpretation I do not raise the question of its authenticity here, since we know that Foucault's concern with Greece is for the sort of present. Foucault concedes this when he says, “Form the strictly philosophical point of view the morality of Greek antiquity and contemporary morality have nothing in common” (PPC p. 247).

Notes on Chapter II

[1] PK p. 156.

[2] Foucault's analysis in MC should not be confused with Weber's thesis. Foucault's 'structuralism' separates him from Weber's individualism. As against Weber Foucault situates and explain 'ethical consciousness' in term of and in the context of the bourgeois order. In HS Foucault criticises Weberian work ethic thesis in the following terms:

> " . . . it seems that the deployment of sexuality was not established as a principle of limitation of the pleasures of others by what have traditionally been called the "ruling classes." Rather it appears to me that they first tried it on themselves. Was this a new avatar of that bourgeois asceticism described so many times in connection with the Reformation, the new work ethic, and the rise of capitalism? It seems in fact that what was involved was not an asceticism, in any case not a renunciation of pleasure or a disqualification of the flesh, but on the contrary an intensification of the body, a problematisation of health and its operational terms: it was a question of techniques for maximising life" (HS pp. 122-123).

However this is not to deny certain affinities between Foucauldian and Weberian thematics.

[3] Rawl's justification of Liberal society in Rawls (1971) is based on this line of argumentation.

[4] Consequently it has been relatively easy task to turn Foucault into a theorist of 'governmentality' and of modern modes of governance who has almost nothing to say about capitalism except for few generalisations here and there. Increasingly Foucault's analysis of governance is seen in isolation and this has lead to a flurry of researches in the areas of governmentality, liberalism etc turning Foucault into an innovative but totally incorporationist third way theorist. This has further obscured Foucault's analysis in relation to the problematic of capital accumulation as modern political theory's divorce from and isolation from the analysis of capitalism has been complete since long.

[5] As mentioned in chapter one, all three relations imply each other. Consequently the decision to include certain aspects under one relation while certain other aspects under the other ones have been to a greater extent arbitrary. The only guiding principle has been the overall argument.

[6] In this section my emphasis is on the justification of subjectivity side while the creation of subjectivity side is explicated in the context of truth regime.

[7] In USA for example the most developed capitalist society to date.

[8] It must be clear here that for capitalism specific techniques discussed were important only in short run, the long run interest of capitalism has not been in these specific techniques but in the evolvement of general strategy out of these specific technologies. Thus the long run interest of capitalism is the general strategy for the controlled production and reproduction of manageable subjectivity out of these specific techniques of the controlled production and reproduction of criminals.

[9] cf. Foucault 1970.

[10] Perhaps Bentham's dual role as the inventor of the technology of power (panopticon) and his being the founder of utilitarianism reinforces the connection between power regime and accumulation regime in capitalist system.

[11] Foucault's obsession with death, which is well documented (see for e.g. Macey 1994, Miller 1993 and Veyne 1997b) should be seen in this context.

[12] This is because of the fact that the underlying rationality is same.

[13] This is the ambition of this state, its nature.

[14] Perhaps it would seem that in today's world only those escape the tyranny of capital who are ready to sacrifice life.

[15] "When one defines the exercise of power as a mode of action upon the actions of others, when one characterises these actions by the government of men by other men – in the broadest sense of the term – one includes an important element: freedom. Power is exercised only over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free. By this we mean individual or collective subjects who are faced with a field of possibilities in which several ways of behaving, several reactions and diverse compartments may be realised. Where the determining factors saturate the whole there is no relationship of power; slavery is not a power relationship when man

is in chains. In this case it is a question of a physical relationship of constraint. Consequently there is no face to face confrontation of power and freedom which is mutually exclusive (freedom disappears everywhere power is exercised), but a much more complicated interplay. In this game freedom may well appear as the condition for the exercise of power (at the same time its precondition, since freedom must exist for power to be exerted, and also its permanent support, since without the possibility of recalcitrance, power would be equivalent to a physical determination). The relationship between power and freedom's refusal to submit cannot therefore be separated. The crucial problem of power is not that of voluntary servitude (how could we seek to be slaves?). At the very heart of the power relation, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom" (ibid. pp. 221-222).

[16] Liberalism is here used to refer to liberal regimes and not to liberalism as an ideal

[17] In both senses.
[18] On Adorno see Roberts 1988.

Notes on Chapter III

[1] quoted in Negri and Hardt 2000 p. 393.

[2] Deleuze 1988 p. 89.

[3] The level of domination in any society is determined by the sum total of relations their internal dynamics and their overall balance and the same determines the level of the possibility of resistance in any society.

[4] And this is how alternatives infect manifest themselves in history and to disregard this mechanism is mere delusion.

[5] more precisely 'constituted'.

[6] It should be noted here that Foucault is not recommending a minimising of the role of state, a la Nozick or the new classical economists but its abolishing. Foucault as against Nozick and classical economists does not believe that the state in the narrow sense does not perform any positive function for production. As against Nozick and classical economists Foucault is not so much concerned with state in the narrow sense but about the nature of state, that is the governmental rationality that forms the basis of subjection. Similarly Foucault is not primarily concerned with the role of state in economy but with the effect of state intervention in terms of subjection.

[7] Although the primary target is not accumulation of capital but accumulation of men.

[8] Provided Foucault's conceptions about the orientation of the people (their commitment to diversity and rejection of the singularity of capital accumulation) and about the possibility of transcending capitalist truth, power, subjectivity regimes without articulating an anti capitalist singularity are valid. If these conceptions are false then Foucauldian struggles may be seen as futile attempts at transcending capitalism. Needless to say Foucault does not think so.

Appendix

The Argument

Hypothesis:

"As struggles for freedom Foucauldian struggles are seen by and conceptualised by Foucault as struggles that (may) pose system wide danger to capitalism".

Chapter I

Foucault's Analysis of modern Capitalism.

1.1 **Freedom - the Universal:** Freedom provides the justification and context of all struggles in West since its successful revolt against Christianity and its normative authority.

1.2 **Foucault's work and Freedom:** Freedom is the theme, which provides the context for Foucault's work.

1.3 Foucault's and Negative freedom.

1.3.1 Two senses of Negative freedom in Foucault: Two received interpretations of Negative freedom in Foucault and their critique. First interpretation ascribes the notion of 'totalised breaking out' to Foucault hence ignoring Foucault's analysis about inevitability of the web of relations. The second interpretation deemphasises empancipatory theme in Foucault by assuming that 'we are freer than we think we are'.

1.3.2 Foucault's conception of Negative freedom: Reconstruction of Foucault's conception of Negative freedom by combing the valid points of the two received interpretations into an organic whole while avoiding their shortcomings. It emerges that Foucault considers the reconstitution of the web of relationships as necessary even for the realisation of Negative freedom.

1.3.3 Negative freedom and morality: Rejection of morality necessary for the realisation of Negative freedom.

1.3.4 Negative freedom and knowledge: Rejection of knowledge as the basis of morality.

1.4 Foucault and Positive freedom: Foucault defends a minimalist conception of positive freedom as necessary for the practice of negative freedom.

1.4.1 Positive freedom as construction of self: Negative freedom entails construction of self.

1.4.2 Positive freedom and aesthetic of existence: construction of self without recourse to any pre given rules since reference to any pre given rules would contradict Negative freedom.

1.4.3 Freedom as Practice: Freedom as practice on the level of the whole web of relationships necessary for the reconstitution of self to self relationship on the autonomous basis as all relationships imply each other and can not be reconstituted in isolation.

1.5 Conclusion: Freedom as the universal to which Foucault refers and according to which he proposes his alternative.

Chapter II

Foucault's Analysis of modern Capitalism

2.1 Foucault and modern capitalism: An introduction.

2.1.1. Foucault's analysis is situated in the context of capitalism but this context remains largely implicit.

2.1.2 Brief overview of his work to show the relevance of capitalism for Foucault's analysis.

2.1.3 Foucault does not study capitalism as such but the conditions of the possibility of capitalism.

2.1.4 The significance of capitalism as the context of analysis is further obscured by the fact that the relation between the conditions of the possibility of capitalism and capitalism itself is now here specified in any detail (though the overall picture stands clear).

2.2 The condition of the possibility of capitalism.

2.2.1 Manageable subjectivity is necessary for capitalism. Accumulation to be carried out requires corresponding production and reproduction of manageable subjectivity. Accumulation requires manageable subjection.

2.2.1.1 Manageable subjectivity is produced and reproduced through the notion of identity and morality. Identity and morality provides the means to impose singularity on multiplicity and diversity.

2.2.2 Truth regime (capitalist truth regime): An overview

2.2.2.1 For the production and reproduction of the system of capital accumulation the capitalist system needs to have access to 'individual' (soul and body) and population. It simultaneously needs to know (in the empirical sense) and create (in the normative sense) the truth of individual and population. Through this link truth regime is linked to power regime and formation of subjectivity in modern capitalism.

2.2.3 Capitalist state: An overview

2.2.3.1 The emergence of the state in the modern sense of the word.

2.2.3.2 The increase in the ambit of this state.

2.2.3.3 This power of modern state is based on the emergence of new type of power / bio-power / disciplinary power.

2.2.3.4 By 'bio- power' Foucault wanted to emphasise two aspects of this power. First it is power centered on life. Second it is power over body as species being and it is power over 'population'.

2.2.3.5 By 'discipline' Foucault wanted to emphasise two types of effects of power on individual through which power can have access to the body and soul of individual at the same time.

2.2.3.6 Combination of these four aspects gave formidable power to modern state over individual and society which is unprecedented in history.

2.3 Management of Freedom through Freedom

2.3.1. Foucault's claim is that in capitalism limitation of diversity is maintained through freedom itself and not through repression. Capitalism's interest is not fulfilled by curbing and limitation per se. Capitalism's interest is to produce a manageable type of subjectivity and manageable type of power and truth regime.

2.3.1.1 Thus Capitalism allows diversification and multiplication but only a specific manageable diversification and multiplication.

2.4 Three conditions and freedom. Foucault's analysis that these conditions of the possibility of capitalism as the very conditions that hinder the possibility of freedom.

2.5 Market, State and Freedom.

2.5.1 Market as the arena of accumulation in general.

2.5.2 State and the regime of accumulation in general as the condition of the Market as the arena of accumulation in general.
2.5.3 Actually existing (specific) markets as the arena of specific accumulation.
2.5.4 Actually existing capitalist states and accumulation regimes are the conditions of markets as the arena of specific accumulation with the provision that on this level conditioning conditioned relationship also exists in the sense that techniques in one arena can be projected onto the other and vice versa.
2.5.5 Viewed from this angle capitalist state as capitalist governmental rationality and capitalist state as the administrative and coercive institution and corresponding regime of accumulation of men is the condition and foundation of the possibility of Market as the arena of accumulation in general and market as the arena of specific accumulation.

2.6 Foucault's critique of Marxist analysis of capitalism.

2.6.1 Rejection of concept of ideology and repression.
2.6.2 Overemphasis on economic determinism in capitalism.
2.6.3 Rejection of exploitation;
2.6.4 Inability to understand the nature of discontent and struggle against capitalism due to limitation of dialectical method.
2.6.4 Stalinism as capitalism.

2.7 To Fight against subjection Foucauldian and not Marxist struggles are needed.

Chapter III

Foucauldian Struggles

3.1. **Foucault's theorisation of struggles in general.**

3.1.1. Struggles are permanent feature of human societies because quest for freedom is unique feature of human beings. Human beings by nature aspire to freedom and since Foucault has defined freedom as struggle (chapter 1). Struggles becomes the permanent feature of human societies.

3.1.2. Thus Foucault theorises struggles as a permanent way of relating to particular power, truth and subjectivity regime.

3.1.3. This way of relating to a particular power / truth / subjectivity regime has a fundamental structure that is defined by search for freedom.

3.1.3.1 Questioning a particular power / truth / subjectivity regime. This questioning which is permanent occurs on three levels. On the general level every power / truth / subjectivity regime must be permanently questioned. This questioning emanate form commitment to freedom. On the second level this general critique take the from of a particular critique. Particular questioning is directed towards the present power / truth / subjectivity regime. Finally this regime is not to be questioned for its own sake but only those aspects of it to be questioned which hinders freedom.

3.1.3.2 Limit attitude. Transgressing those aspect of power / truth / subjectivity which hinders freedom. Transgression as entering into difficult relation, with reality.

3.1.3.3 Experimental attitude.

- No reference to theory, since freedom is practice.
- No reference to utopia as these can be no utopia
- Only reference point is reality & freedom

3.2. Struggles are not struggles against exploitation or domination. Foucault's struggles are against subjection. Subjection is the effect of power / truth / subjectivity regime. Subjection is to be differentiated from domination and exploitation.

3.2.1. Struggles against subjection and their nature.

3.2.2. Struggle against capitalist governance

3.2.2.1. Struggle against capitalist epistemology.

3.2.2.2. Struggle against capitalist state

3.2.2.3. Struggle against capitalist subjectivity and govt. of individuals

3.3. Possibility of system wide resistance and local character of struggles.

3.4. Conclusion

Bibliography

Note on Abbreviations

I will use the following abbreviations for texts and interviews I cite.

DP Michael Foucault (1977) **Discipline and Punish: the birth of prison** London Penguin.

FR Michael Foucault (1984) **The Foucault Reader** ed. P. Rabinow Harmondsworth Penguin.

HS Michael Foucault (1979) **The History of Sexuality vol. 1: An Introduction** London Penguin.

MC Michel Foucault (1965) **Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason** translated by Richard Howard New York Pantheon.

PK Michael Foucault (1980) **Power Knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977** ed. C Gordon New York Pantheon.

PPC Michael Foucault (1988) **Politics, Philosophy, Culture: interviews and other writings 1977-1984** ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman New York Routledge.

RM Michael Foucault (1991) **Remarks on Marx:** Conversation with Duccio Trombadori trans. R. James Goldstein and James Cascatio New York Semiotext(e).

SP Micheal Foucault (1983) "The Subject and Power" as afterwards to Dreyfus and Rabinow 1983.

REFERENCES

Giorgio Agamben (1993) **Infancy and History** trans. Liz Heron London Verso.

Hannah Arendt (1961) **Between Past and Future: six exercises in political thought** London Faber and Faber.

Timothy J. Armstrong trans. and ed. (1992) **Michel Foucault Philosopher** Hamel Hempstead England Harvester Wheatsheaf.

S. Zeeshan Arshad (1999) "Freedom in Modernist Discourse" **Pakistan Business Review** vol. 1 No. 2 pp. 479-571.

Roy Bashker (1991) **Philosophy and the Idea of Freedom** Oxford Oxford University Press.

Frederick C Beiser (1987) **The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte** Cambridge Mass MIT Press.

Vikki Bell (1996) "The promise of liberalism and the performance of freedom" in Rose **et al** eds. (1996).

Isaiah Berlin (1969) **Four Concepts of Liberty** Oxford Oxford University Press.

Jay M. Bernstein (1996) “The Causality of the Fate: Modernity and Modernism in Habermas” in D’entreves and Benhabib eds. (1996) **Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity** Cambridge Polity Press.

Phillip Blond (1998) “Introduction: Theology before Philosophy” in Phillip Blond ed. (1998) **Post Secular Philosophy: Between Philosophy and Theology** London Routledge.

Tom Bottomore ed. (1991) **Marxist Dictionary** Oxford Blackwell.

G. Canguilhem (1989) **Normal and the Pathological** New York Zone Books.

Fredrich C. Copelston (1955) **A History of Philosophy Book I-III** London Image Books.

John Cottinghum (1986) **Descartes** Oxford Blackwell

Arnold I. Davidson (1997) **Foucault and his Interlocutors** London Chicago University Press.

Gilles Deleuze (1988) **Foucault** trans. Sean Hard Minneapolis University of Minnesota Press.

Rene Descartes (1965) **Discourse on Method** trans. Paul J. Olscamp Indianapolis Bobbs-Merrill.

Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow (1983) **Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics** Chicago Chicago University Press.

Michel Foucault (1970) **The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences** New York Random House.

Michel Foucault (1972) **Archaeology of Knowledge** trans. A Sheridan London Tavistock.

Michel Foucault (1977) **Language, Counter memory and Practice** trans. and eds. Donald Bouchard and Sherry Simon Ithaca Cornell University Press.

Michel Foucault (1985) **The Use of Pleasure History of Sexuality vol. 2** trans. Robert Hurley London Penguin.

Michel Foucault (1987) “The Ethic of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom” trans. J. D. Gauthier **Philosophy and Social Criticism** special issue “The Final Foucault” 12 Summer.

Michel Foucault (1988) **Technologies of Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault** eds. Luther H. Martin et al. Amherst University of Massachusetts Press.

Michel Foucault (1989) "Introduction" to G. Canguilhem (1989).

Michel Foucault (1989a) **Foucault Live** ed. Sylvere Lotringer New York Semiotext(e).

Michel Foucault (1990) **The Care of Self History of Sexuality vol. 3** trans. Robert Hurley London Penguin.

Michel Foucault (1994) **Dits et écrits 1954-1988** eds. Daniel Defert and François Ewald Paris Gallimard.

Michel Foucault (1997) “Madness, the Absence of Work” trans. Peter Stastny and Deniz Sengel in Arnold I. Davidson ed. 1997.

John Gray (1995) **Enlightenment Wake: Politics and Culture at the End of the Modern Age** Oxford Blackwell.

John Gray (1999) **False Dawn: Delusions of Global Capitalism** London Granta Books

Gary Gutting (1989) **Michel Foucault's Archaeology of Scientific Reason** London Cambridge University Press.

G. Gutting ed. (1994) **The Cambridge Companion to Foucault** Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

W Hegel (1951) **Hegel’s Science of Logic vol. 1** trans. W. H. Johnston and L. G. Struthers London George Allen and Unwin.

David C. Hoy ed. (1986) **Foucault: A Critical Reader** Oxford Basil Blackwell.

Martin Heidegger (1962) **Kant and the problem of Metaphysics** trans. James S. Churchill Bloomington Indiana University Press.

Susan Himmelweit (1991) “Exploitation” in Bottomore ed. 1991

Immanuel Kant (1929) **Critique of Pure Reason** trans. N. Kemp Smith London Macmillan.

Immanuel Kant (1949) **The Philosophy of Kant: Immanuel Kant’s Moral and Political Writings** ed. Carl J. Friedrich New York Modern Library.

Immanuel Kant (1976) **Critique of Practical Reason** trans. Lewis White Beck Indianapolis Bobbs-Merril.

Immanuel Kant (1981) **Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals** trans. James W. Ellington Indianapolis Hackett Publishing Company.

Richard Korner (1956) **Kant's Weltanschauung** trans. and ed. John E Smith Chicago. Chicago University Press.

Lawrance D. Kritzman (1988) “Foucault and the Politics of Experience” introduction to **PPC**.

Jorge Larrain (1991) “Base Super Structure” in Bottomore ed. 1991.

David Macey (1994) **The Lives of Michel Foucault** London Vintage.

Karl Marx (1963) “Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right” in T. B. Bottomore ed. (1963) **Karl Marx: Early Writings** London.

Istavon Meszaros (1995) **Beyond Capital** London Merlin

Istavon Meszaros (1996) “The Legacy of Marx” in Peter Osborne ed. **A Critical Sense: Interviews with Intellectuals** London Routledge.

A Megill (1985) **Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida** Berkeley California University Press.

James Miller (1993) **The Passion of Michel Foucault** New York Anchor Books.

Antonio Negri and Michel Hardt (2000) **Empire** Cambridge Mass. Harvard University Press.

Mark Neocleous and Stuart Elden (1997) **"**'The Police Includes Everything' Foucault, Hegel and the Police Concept" Unpublished article.

Orlando Paterson (1991) **Freedom vol. 1, Freedom in the making of Western Civilisation** New York Basic Books.

John Rajchman (1991) **Truth and Eros: Foucault, Lacan and the Question of Ethics** London Routledge.

John Rawls (1971) **Theory of Justice** Oxford Oxford University Press.

Julian Roberts (1988) **German Philosophy: An Introduction** Oxford Polity Press.

Nicholas Rose (1993) **Towards a Critical Sociology of Freedom** Inaugural Lecture delivered on 5 May 1992 at Goldsmith College University of London Goldsmiths College Occasional Paper.

Nicholas Rose **et al** eds. (1996) **Foucault and Political Reason** London UCL Press.

Michel J Sandel ed. (1984) **Liberalism and its critics** Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Rojer J. Sullivan (1989) **Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory** London Cambridge University Press.

R. Tawny (1959) **Religion and the Rise of Capitalism** Harmondsworth Penguin.

Charles Taylor (1975) **Hegel** London Cambridge University Press

Charles Taylor (1989) **Sources of Self: The making of Modern Identity** New York Cambridge University Press.

Leslie P. Thielly (1995) **Timely Meditations: Martin Heidegger and Postmodern Politics** Princeton. Princeton University Press.

Robert C. Tucker (1964) **Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx** Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Paul Veyne (1997a) "Foucault Revolutionise History" in Arnold I. Davidson ed. 1997.

Paul Veyne (1997b) "The Final Foucault and His Ethics" in Arnold I. Davidson ed. 1997.

Bernard Williams (1978) **Descartes: The Project of Pure Enquiry** Harmondsworth Penguin.

Foucault on Freedom

An Analytical Examination of foucauldian Philosophy

By

Dr.Ali Muhamamd Rizvi

Karachi University Research Forum

جامعہ کراچی دارُلتحقیق برائے علم و دانش